



**STATE OF MARYLAND
OUT-OF-HOME PLACEMENT
AND FAMILY PRESERVATION RESOURCE PLAN**

FY2011

Prepared by:



Governor's Office for Children
Promoting the well-being of Maryland's children

*On behalf of
The Children's Cabinet*

*Submitted on
December 15, 2011*

Acknowledgements-

The following persons provided invaluable assistance with this report:

Department of Health and Mental Hygiene

Susan Bradley, Mental Hygiene Administration
Eric English, Mental Hygiene Administration
Tom Merrick, Mental Hygiene Administration
Bette Anne Mobley, Developmental Disabilities Administration
Sequoya Tasker, Developmental Disabilities Administration
William Rusinko, Alcohol and Drug Abuse Administration
Al Zachik, Mental Hygiene Administration

Department of Human Resources

David Ayer, Social Services Administration
Linda Carter, Social Services Administration
Carnitra White, Social Services Administration

Department of Juvenile Services

Bill Drollinger, Fiscal Planning and Management
John Irvine, Research and Evaluation
Lakshmi Iyengar, Research and Evaluation
Melissa Liszewski, Fiscal Planning and Management

Governor's Office for Children

Shanda Crowder, Chief, Interagency Initiatives
Deborah Donohue, Principal Counsel
Dennis Eichenlaub, IT Systems Analyst
Scott Finkelsen, Chief, Finance and Operations
Rosemary King Johnston, Executive Director
Kim Malat, Chief, Grant and Contract Administration
Steven Schreiber-Stahl, Policy & Program Specialist
Mark Scott, Administrative Assistant, Interagency Initiatives
Antoinette Thomas, Chief Information Officer

Maryland State Department of Education

Jodi King, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services
Jeff Miller, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services
Marcella Franczkowski, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

For further information or copies of this report, please visit the Governor's Office for Children's website at www.goc.maryland.gov.

Table of Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	i
<i>Section I: Introduction & Overview</i>	1
Background.....	1
Data Collection Methodology & Considerations.....	3
Overview.....	5
Report Overview.....	6
<i>Section II: Statewide Summary & Highlights</i>	10
Overview.....	10
Out-of-Home Placement (OOHP) Summary Data: State of Maryland.....	10
Rate of Entry by Jurisdiction for OOHP.....	13
Demographic Summary: Age, Gender and Race.....	14
All Out-of-Home Placements by All Agencies.....	16
Out-of-State (OOS) Placements.....	18
Overall Costs associated with OOHP.....	19
Agency Overviews.....	21
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES (DHR) OVERVIEW.....	22
DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE SERVICES (DJS) OVERVIEW.....	41
<i>Section III: Family Home Settings</i>	55
Overview.....	55
Family Home Settings: Statewide Summary.....	58
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES (DHR).....	60
DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE SERVICES (DJS).....	72
<i>Section IV: Community-Based Residential Programs</i>	78
Overview.....	78
Community-Based Residential Programs Statewide Summary.....	82
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES (DHR).....	84
DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE SERVICES (DJS).....	93
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND MENTAL HYGIENE DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES ADMINISTRATION (DDA).....	101
<i>Section V: Non-Community-Based Residential Placements</i>	109
Overview.....	109

Non-Community-Based Residential Programs Statewide Summary.....	112
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES (DHR)	113
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES (DHR)	114
DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE SERVICES (DJS).....	119
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND MENTAL HYGIENE ALCOHOL AND DRUG AND ABUSE ADMINISTRATION (ADAA).....	129
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND MENTAL HYGIENE MENTAL HYGIENE ADMINISTRATION (MHA).....	138
MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (MSDE)	148
<i>Section VI: Hospitalizations</i>	157
Overview.....	157
Hospitalizations Statewide Summary	159
<i>Section VII: Maryland School for the Blind and Maryland School for the Deaf</i>	163
The Maryland School for the Deaf	163
The Maryland School for the Blind	163
<i>Section VIII: Family Preservation Services</i>	165
<i>Section IX: Children’s Cabinet Resource Development Initiatives & Conclusion</i>	181
Resource Development Initiatives	181
Conclusion	186
<i>Appendices</i>	187
APPENDIX A: PLACEMENT BY JURISDICTION TABLES	188
Appendix B: FY 2011 In-State Placements Capacity & Utilization by Placement Category & Agency	216
Appendix C: FY 2011 Out-Of-State Placements Capacity & Utilization by Placement Category & Agency	259

Section I: Introduction & Overview

Background

The State is responsible for linking children served in out-of-home care with placements and services that meet their needs. It is imperative that the State conducts ongoing, unified and comprehensive reviews of the placements and provision of services provided to the children placed in our care. The purpose of the Out-of-Home Placement (OOHP) and Family Preservation Resource Plan (The Report) is to document the State's capacity for and utilization of out-of-home placements, analyze the cost associated with out-of-home placement, facilitate an evaluation of Statewide family preservation programs, and identify areas of need across Maryland. The Report fulfills the requirement, pursuant to the Maryland Annotated Code, Human Services Article, §8-703, to produce annually a State Resource Plan "in order to enhance access to services provided by RCCPs" and the Joint Chairmen's Report requesting an evaluation of "Maryland's family preservation programs in stemming the flow of children from their homes."

The Out-of-Home Placement and Family Preservation Resource Plan (The Report) for Fiscal Year 2011 (FY2011) is similar to the Fiscal Year 2010 (FY2010) Report and will be a consolidation of the two reports listed above. The Report reflects information as reported by the child-serving agencies including Department of Human Resources (DHR), Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (DHMH), Department of Juvenile Services (DJS) and Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE). Unlike previous reports, the FY2011 report includes a separate discussion of the in-State and out-of-State (OOS) placements in an effort to provide an in-depth review of both placement types.

The Children's Cabinet (CC) approved enhancements to The Report, including a revised data collection methodology, specific data request, and the individual agencies' responsibility to develop corresponding narrative for the data. It is our intent that the data collection plan will continue efforts from the FY2010 report to ensure that The Report consistently and accurately reports data reflecting the status of out-of-home placements across the State. The data request was further expanded this year to collect additional information on out-of-State placements.

In Maryland, children enter out-of-home care for a variety of reasons and under a number of different circumstances. Children may be placed in the care and custody of the State when they are determined to be a Child In Need of Assistance (CINA), a Child In Need of Supervision (CINS), or Delinquent. Children can also enter placement through a Voluntary Placement Agreement (VPA) in which a parent voluntarily places a child in the care of the State. This most often occurs when a child is unable to access funding for needed treatment through any avenue other than being in the care of the State. The State Child-Serving Agencies and Administrations responsible for placing children in out-of-home placements are the DHR through the Local Departments of Social Services (LDSS); DJS; and DHMH, including the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Administration (ADAA), Developmental Disabilities Administration (DDA), and the Mental Hygiene Administration (MHA). Although the MSDE funds out-of-home placements made by the Local School Systems (LSS), MSDE is not a placement agency and does not place

children out-of-home. It should be noted that children whose placements are funded by MSDE, either in whole or in part, will be discussed in this report as well as children placed by other Agencies and Administrations. These Agencies and Administrations may fund the placements or the placements may be funded by Medical Assistance (MA), which is administered within DHMH. Placements may also be co-funded by several State Agencies.

Each of these child-placing and funding Agencies and Administrations operates differently at the local level. DHMH (ADAA and MHA), DHR, and MSDE serve children and families through their 24 local counterparts within each of the jurisdictions - the LDSS, the local Core Service Agencies (CSAs)¹, the local Substance Abuse Councils, and the LSS. DJS and DDA have regional offices, which, in turn, have local offices. For administrative purposes, DJS has six designated regions and DDA has four.

These regions are:

DJS

- Baltimore City
- Central Region (Baltimore, Carroll, Harford, and Howard Counties)
- Metro Region (Montgomery and Prince George's Counties)
- Eastern Shore Region (Caroline, Cecil, Dorchester, Kent, Queen Anne's, Somerset, Talbot, Wicomico, and Worcester Counties)
- Southern Region (Anne Arundel, Calvert, Charles, and St. Mary's Counties)
- Western Region (Allegany, Frederick, Garrett, and Washington Counties)

DDA

- Central Region (Anne Arundel County, Baltimore City, and Baltimore, Harford and Howard Counties)
- Eastern Shore Region (Caroline, Cecil, Dorchester, Kent, Queen Anne's, Somerset, Talbot, Wicomico, and Worcester Counties)
- Southern Region (Calvert, Charles, St. Mary's, Montgomery, and Prince George's Counties)
- Western Region (Allegany, Carroll, Frederick, Garrett, and Washington Counties)

¹ One Core Service Agency located on the Eastern Shore serves five jurisdictions.

Data Collection Methodology & Considerations

An Out-of-Home Placement Interagency Workgroup (Workgroup) was convened by the Children's Cabinet FY2011 to review the Fiscal Year 2010 (FY2010) data collection methodology and develop a more specific work plan for all data elements including reporting guidelines and submission requirements. Representatives of each Agency met throughout Fiscal Year 2011 (FY2011) and participated in the planning and development of the current report.

This is the second year that GOC, on behalf of the Children's Cabinet (CC), did not request detailed raw data from each agency. Rather, GOC requested that agencies provide aggregate data and corresponding narrative. This is one component of a concerted effort to ensure the data presented in the report accurately reflects the data each agency uses in other agency-generated reports. GOC acknowledges that there will be incidences of duplicative placement information, so will ensure The Report contains appropriate disclaimers. The Fiscal Year and One-day count data used to develop this Report will be available electronically on GOC's website.

The FY2011 Report uses aggregate data submitted by each Agency for the fiscal years and one-day placements for each fiscal year as noted in the FY2011 Report section below. Accuracy of reported data reporting is dependent on a clearly stated data request. The Workgroup met initially with the agencies to discuss reporting needs. Each Agency was provided a data request guide along with data collection templates for data reporting and clarification of the information request. The guidance removed the uncertainty associated with providing the required aggregate data for this year's report. GOC also met individually with each Agency to ensure a thorough understanding of reporting requirements as well as recognition of the Agency's unique placement process and data collection.

FY2011 Report

Each child-serving Agency was requested to provide aggregate data using specific templates for children in placement and associated cost for the last three fiscal years. The following information defines the parameters of the requested data.

Age Group:

This report considers placement for children through their 21st birthday (*i.e.*, age 20.999) on the date of admission for new placements and July 1st of the fiscal year for carryover placements. Placements that are funded by MSDE include children who are served through the academic year of their 21st birthday.

Reporting Period:

The charts and graphs featured in this report are derived from two data sources – “full fiscal year” data and “one-day census.” The difference between the two is very important to note. This Report marks graphs using fiscal year data with a blue background and graphs using the one-day census with a white, or blank, background.

These are the definitions for each data reporting period:

1. *Full Fiscal Year*: All placements during the fiscal year including carryover placements from the prior fiscal year(s). The fiscal year periods are as follows:

Fiscal Year 2009 (FY2009): July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009

Fiscal Year 2010 (FY2010): July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010

Fiscal Year 2011 (FY2011): July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011

2. *One-Day Census*: The one-day count date used for each fiscal year is as follows:

FY2009: January 31, 2009

FY2010: January 31, 2010

FY2011: January 31, 2011

Definitions:

- “*Bed-day*” - A unit of measurement that refers to a single day in which one child is provided placement at any out-of-home placement.
- “*One-Day Census*” - “One-Day Census” is also sometimes referred to as “One-Day Count.” The measurement of total population on one day out of the year. January 31st is consistently chosen because it is nearly halfway through the fiscal year. This measurement is useful to gauge the total serving capacity of placements at any one time.
- “*Population Flow*” - The total number of placements at start of the fiscal year, new admissions within the fiscal year, discharges within the fiscal year, and placements at the end of the fiscal year.
- “*Rate of New Placement Settings*” - The rate of new admissions into a category of out-of-home placement per 1,000 children (ages 0 to 18) within a given population. The estimate for number of children per jurisdiction can be found in the Appendix.

Data Limitations:

The FY2011 Report utilizes a variety of measurements to capture placement dynamics among diverse services, Agencies, and jurisdictions. Among those measurements are cost per bed-day, one-day census, population flow, and rate of entry per jurisdiction. Although the usefulness of these measurements varies depending on the context, these measurements provide a uniform method based on substantive information for comparing diverse placements and agencies. Where the data serves as only a partial representation of placement dynamics or a particular agency does not calculate data as prescribed by the measurement, the authors of this Report have made an effort to supplement the data and charts with additional information.

As with most measures, there are some limitations of the measurements used in this Report, including:

Cost per Bed-day: Not all agencies calculate bed-days.

One-Day Census: The totals are derived from a count of all children in placement on one day of the year. This is not the total number of children served in placement during the course of the year. The number is meant to show how many children may be in placement at any given time. It is possible that the yearly trend of census totals could be the opposite of an increasing or decreasing trend of “total served,” depending on children’s average length of stay in placement.

Population Flow: The population flow reflects changes in placements throughout the year. A change is considered a discharge or enrollment of any child in either a new placement category (like from family home setting to community-based placement), a new jurisdiction (like a transfer from Somerset to Anne Arundel County), or a new placing agency (like DHR or DJS). Thus, the population flow counts *placements*, and not *children*, because a child can be placed in more than one category, jurisdiction, or agency in one year. This causes duplication of data and the result is that the numbers coming from population flow will be higher than the number of children who are actually placed. Also, the “total served” encompasses children who may have been placed since the previous year or before.

Rate of Entry per Jurisdiction: The rate of entry per jurisdiction data shows a useful trend when many children are being placed within that jurisdiction. But with jurisdictions where few children are placed each year, the difference of one or two children being placed can exaggerate changes in the trend.

DJS Out-of-Home Placement Information: The data given include only youth who are placed in either in-State or out-of-State committed programs. All committed youth are adjudicated delinquent and committed to the custody of DJS by the juvenile court. A continuum of out-of-home placement options has been developed for these youth, ranging from placement in a foster care setting to placement in a secure confinement facility. The cost data reported under each section also reflects only youth in committed placements. “Non-committed” DJS youth, who are not adjudicated or placed by the juvenile court, are not represented in the placement totals and placement costs in this Report.

Report Overview

The FY2011 Report includes a Statewide summary of all out-of-home placements, three-year trend analyses and resource development of out-of-home placements by the Children’s Cabinet placement categories for in-State and out-of-State placements, a description of Maryland’s Family Preservation Services, and a discussion of placements at Maryland’s School for the Blind and School for the Deaf.

It is the intent of the Children’s Cabinet that these enhancements to The Report will provide an accurate and precise analysis of the four macro-placement categories (described below). As the Children’s Cabinet continues to strengthen, develop, and adopt strategies to serve children in their homes and communities, a more comprehensive understanding of the needs of children who require out-of-home placement will evolve. As the Children’s Cabinet improves the tracking and monitoring of placements, and identify meaningful ways to measure progress , both the State and local jurisdictions will benefit through the planning of effective services and utilizing funding in the most effective and efficient manner.

Placement Categories

There are four categories of placement for children in the State of Maryland. These categories are used to describe Maryland’s out-of-home placement continuum, beginning with the least restrictive, most family-like setting (family home settings) and moving progressively towards the most highly structured and treatment-oriented settings (hospitalizations).

Category:	Family Home:	Community-Based:	Non-Community-Based:	Hospitalization:
Subcategory:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adoptive Care • Foster Care • Formal Relative (Kinship) Care • Restricted Relative (Kinship) Care • Treatment Foster Care • Individual Family Care • Living-Arrangement – Family Home 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independent Living Programs • Residential Child Care Program • Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA) • Living Arrangement – Community-Based 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adult Corrections • Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program • Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers • Non-Secure/Non-RTC • Residential Educational Facilities • Residential Treatment Centers • Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM) • Living Arrangement – Non-Community-Based 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-Patient Private • Psychiatric Hospitalization • General Hospitalization

Table 1: Placement Categories

An “Unknown” or “Not Available” placement category is used to describe children who have run away or cannot be identified in another placement category because an Agency’s automated records have not been updated. Differences among the placement subcategories are further explained in each of the placement category descriptions.

While there are a range of out-of-home placement types, only two agencies, DHR and DJS, place children in each of the placement categories. The other agencies – MSDE and the administrations of DHMH (MHA, DDA, and ADAA) – each place children in only one category of placement (although MSDE only funds placements and does not directly place children). The table below (Table 2, page 8) illustrates where the overlaps among agencies in subcategories of placement and the subcategories that are specific to a particular agency.

This Report is divided into the four out-of-home placement categories (Family Home, Community-Based, Non-Community-Based, Hospitalization) followed by Family Preservation Services to families in their own homes. The sections feature a report from each of the agencies that utilize that type of placement and the number and demographics of children served as well as any gaps in services for children that might need to be addressed. Because DHR and DJS are the only agencies that place children in more than one placement category, each of these agencies has a section in this Report summarizing findings from their total placements.

	Family Home Placement							Community-Based Placement				Non-Community-Based Placement							Hospitalization Placement				
	Placing Agency																						
	Adoptive Care	Foster Care	Formal Relative (Kinship) Care	Restricted Relative (Kinship) Care	Treatment Foster Care	Individual Family Care	Living Arrangement - Family Home	Independent Living Programs	Residential Child Care Program	Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA)	Living Arrangement - Community-Based	Adult Corrections	Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	Non-Secure/Non-RTC	Residential Educational Facilities	Residential Treatment Centers	Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	Living Arrangement - Non-Community-Based	In-Patient Private	Psychiatric Hospitalization	General Hospitalization	
ADAA																							
DDA								X	X	X													
MHA																							
MSDE																X	X						
DJS		X			X			X	X				X	X	X		X	X				X	
DHR	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X						X		X	X	X		
Placing Agency																							

Table 2: State Agency Placement Categories

Agencies that place children in only one category of placement (MSDE, ADAA, MHA, and DDA) do not report in the summary section for each agency's total data because that data is captured in reporting for the one category. Accordingly, the sections written by those agencies include information that is otherwise included in the agency-wide summaries provided by DHR and DJS. The subheadings below note those specific to agencies with only one placement category and those specific to agencies with more than one.

Population Totals:

The population total is an overview of the number of children placed by the agency during the one-day census. A pie graph demonstrates the ratio of children placed by subcategory and the line graph illustrates how the number of placements have increased or decreased over the last three years.

Population Flow: (MSDE, ADAA, MHA, DDA)

Unlike the one-day census data, the population flow data follows the total number of children who come into placement during a year, including the amount of placements at the beginning of the year, how many are enrolled, discharged, and remain in placement at the end of the year. The number of total placements is also the basis for the "Rate of Entry" – the rate of children who enter out-of-home placement per one thousand children within the given jurisdiction.

Population Demographics:

Characteristics based on the age, gender, and race of children placed are analyzed using a three year trend and the percent change between each year.

Out-of-State Demographics: (DHR, DJS)

In addition to the total number of children placed in out-of-State care, this section provides the same kind of information as the population demographics, but pertaining only to out-of-State placements.

Placement Costs:

Agencies report on the total costs for each subcategory, as well as the cost per "bed-day." The latter number demonstrates how costs have increased or decreased relative to each child/youth that is placed in care.

Section II: Statewide Summary & Highlights

Overview

Data reported and discussed in this section of The Report represent two sources: a one-day census in Maryland, conducted on January 31st of each fiscal year of all children in out-of-home placements made or funded by Maryland Agencies or Administrations, and data on demographics, cost, and rate of entry for each fiscal year.

Information on each child was gathered by the placing or funding Agency/Agencies and submitted to the Governor's Office for Children (GOC) for inclusion in this Report. The Report provides information on the number of placements in particular categories of out-of-home placements and analyzes them within the context of the children's home jurisdiction, the jurisdiction in which they are placed, and the placement or funding Agency/Agencies.

This section provides a summary of the Statewide data and highlight key findings.

Out-of-Home Placement (OOHP) Summary Data: State of Maryland





Chart 1: Placements by Agency 1/31/2011

There are four agencies in the State of Maryland that place children, one of which includes the three administrations contained in DHMH: DDA, MHA, and ADAA. Of the four agencies, DHR places the majority of children in out-of-home placement. 81% of children in out-of-home placement counted during the one-day census in 2011, a total of 7,615 children had been referred by DHR. It must be noted that because some children are placed by more than one agency, there are actually fewer children in placement than the number of placements counted.



All Agencies All Categories Placement Trends				Percent Change	
Category	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Community-Based Residential Placement	2035	1718	1514	-15.6%	-11.9%
Family Home Settings	6755	6490	5840	-3.9%	-10.0%
Hospitalization	29	31	43	6.9%	38.7%
Non-Community-Based Residential Placement	1704	1686	1640	-1.1%	-2.7%
Placement Category Not Available	251	435	336	73.3%	-22.8%
All Categories	10774	10360	9373	-3.8%	-9.5%

Chart 2/Table 3: One-day Count-All Agencies All Categories Placement Trends

From 2009 to 2011, the total number of children counted during the one-day census has steadily decreased. The average change has been a decrease of 6.65% per year. With the exception of hospitalizations, which are utilized for such a low number of placements that the percent change is exaggerated despite small fluctuations, all other placement categories have shown a decrease in the total population during the one-day census. While these numbers do not reflect the total population of children served during the year, they are reflective of the number of children in placement at one given time.




Chart 3: All Agencies Placements by Category 1/3/2011

Based on the 2011 one-day census, family home settings are the most utilized placement type at 62%. Family home settings are reserved for children with less intensive needs who are able to be served in the community environment by a foster parent or relative/kinship parent. These placements allow children to remain in their communities following placement and to continue school and maintain positive relationships with family members during placement. The intended result is that children in placement will have better outcomes in education and relationships with family and their length of stay in placement will be shortened before exiting to be with a permanent caregiver.

All Agencies Placement Population Flow - All Placements (count of placements, not children)					
State Fiscal Year	Placements at Start of FY	Starts in FY (New Placements)	Total Served	Ends in FY (Placement Exits)	Placements at End of FY
2009	11337	17359	28696	17557	11139
2010	10499	17636	28135	17972	10163
2011	9630	17017	26647	17483	9164
Two-Year Change	-15.1%	-2.0%	-7.1%	-0.4%	-17.7%
Average Yearly Change	-7.5%	-1.0%	-3.6%	-0.2%	-8.9%
Recent-Year Change	-8.3%	-3.5%	-5.3%	-2.7%	-9.8%

Table 4: FY All Agencies Placement Population Flow

From FY2009 to FY2011, the average yearly trend has shown a decrease of 3.6% in the number of children served. The average yearly trend of children served in out-of-home placement is less than the yearly decrease of children counted during the one-day census, which is 6.65%, as seen above. However, there are substantial decreases in the number of children counted on each subsequent start and end of the fiscal year. This is consistent with the fact that larger decreases are observed in the one-day census. It may mean that although the number of children counted during the one-day census is decreasing at a high rate, the children being placed are being placed for shorter amounts of time, resulting in a faster turnover and also more children served.

Rate of Entry by Jurisdiction for OOHP

All Agencies Rate of New Placement Settings by Jurisdiction						
Jurisdiction	2009	2010	2011	Two-Year Change	Average Change	One-Year Change
Allegany	18.0	13.9	14.4	-20%	-10%	3%
Anne Arundel	5.5	5.5	4.9	-10%	-5%	-10%
Baltimore	9.2	10.3	9.7	6%	3%	-6%
Baltimore City	43.5	44.7	43.1	-1%	0%	-4%
Calvert	6.8	9.0	9.4	38%	19%	4%
Caroline	14.0	12.7	14.2	1%	1%	12%
Carroll	4.6	5.3	6.2	33%	17%	16%
Cecil	11.1	13.0	13.4	21%	10%	3%
Charles	7.3	8.1	7.7	5%	2%	-6%
Dorchester	17.4	19.5	16.3	-6%	-3%	-16%
Frederick	6.7	8.4	7.6	13%	6%	-9%
Garrett	17.8	22.0	15.5	-13%	-6%	-29%
Harford	9.0	8.1	8.2	-9%	-4%	2%
Howard	3.2	2.9	2.9	-10%	-5%	-2%
Kent	18.3	11.3	9.9	-46%	-23%	-12%
Montgomery	6.4	5.6	5.2	-19%	-10%	-8%
Prince George's	5.3	5.9	5.7	8%	4%	-4%
Queen Anne's	9.2	8.5	6.6	-28%	-14%	-22%
Somerset	11.9	17.1	15.4	29%	15%	-10%
St. Mary's	8.9	8.2	11.7	32%	16%	43%
Talbot	10.9	9.8	11.5	5%	2%	16%
Washington	13.0	13.1	13.8	6%	3%	5%
Wicomico	11.5	10.6	10.9	-5%	-3%	3%
Worcester	13.8	14.8	12.8	-7%	-3%	-13%
Total	11.4	11.6	11.2	-2%	-1%	-3%

Table 5: OOHP Rate of Entry

The rate of new placement settings is the number of children who are counted as “new placements” (from the previous Population Flow chart) divided by the number of children (from birth to 19-year-olds) in that jurisdiction, and multiplied by 1,000 to get the rate per 1,000. It is the number of children who enter a new placement category or jurisdiction between July 1st and June 30th within a given year. In jurisdictions where more children enter placement relative to the population of children in that jurisdiction, changes in the rate of entry per year are less

significant, such as in Baltimore City. In other jurisdictions with a lower rate of entry into placement, such as Allegany, Kent and Queen Anne’s counties, the change between years appears greater, as it sometimes represents the difference between ten or fewer children being placed.

Demographic Summary: Age, Gender and Race

Age




Chart 4/Table 6: One-Day Count-All Agencies All Categories Age Trends

42.3% of children in placement are ages 12 through 17, the age group with the highest number of children placed. The largest decreases in placement among age groups have been observed among the 6 through 11 year-olds. There have actually been more youth 18 and older in placement during the past few years, possibly because transitional services have been extended to assist them in developing independent living skills following their 18th birthday. This trend has been observed in every placement category.

Gender




Chart 5/Table 7: One-Day Count-All Agencies All Categories Gender Trends

The ratio of males to females in placement has remained fairly steady at around 56% male and 44% female.

Race




Chart 6/Table 8: One-Day Count-All Agencies All Categories Race Trends

Although Black/African-American children have seen the highest percentage decrease in placement since 2009 (of any subgroup over 30 in number), Black/African-American children represent 67% of children in placement as reported on the one-day census in 2011. This subgroup is followed by White children who constitute 25% of children in placement.

All Out-of-Home Placements by All Agencies

Table 9 (page 17) provides an overview of the number of placements reported in the single-day count by jurisdiction and location of placement. The first column provides the number of out-of-home placements from the home jurisdiction on the single-day count. The second column provides the percentage that number represents with regard to the total number of Statewide placements on that date. The columns that follow provide the name of the jurisdiction where the placement occurred. The rows at the bottom of the table provide the percentage of placements from the jurisdiction that are also placed within that jurisdiction. The final row provides the percentage of placements in that jurisdiction out of the total number of Statewide placements reported on that date.

All Out-of-Home Placements: Number of Placements on January 31, 2011 by Home and Placement Jurisdiction

All Placement Categories and Subcategories																													
Placement Jurisdiction																													
Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown	
Allegany	141	1.5%	103	0	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	13	2	
Anne Arundel	266	2.8%	9	98	48	24	0	5	5	3	7	6	2	8	2	2	1	9	7	1	0	1	0	3	3	0	20	2	
Baltimore	786	8.4%	14	21	391	165	0	2	22	8	1	14	11	10	36	12	1	9	14	0	2	1	0	8	1	1	22	20	
Baltimore City	4595	49.0%	24	114	1107	2399	2	3	43	5	8	22	33	34	88	59	0	34	154	0	9	6	1	30	2	0	152	266	
Calvert	95	1.0%	2	5	6	3	48	1	1	0	6	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	9	1	0	3	0	2	0	0	2	2	
Caroline	47	0.5%	2	2	5	5	0	12	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	2	0	5	0	0	0	
Carroll	81	0.9%	12	1	9	6	0	0	37	0	0	1	4	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	1	0	
Cecil	148	1.6%	2	4	26	10	1	2	1	79	0	2	3	0	5	0	4	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	2	
Charles	159	1.7%	5	2	16	9	8	1	3	0	64	6	1	3	0	0	0	6	21	0	0	3	0	3	0	0	6	2	
Dorchester	52	0.6%	0	5	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	29	0	2	0	1	1	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	1	1	
Frederick	228	2.4%	3	4	10	6	0	2	3	1	0	0	116	0	1	4	0	19	8	0	0	0	0	39	0	0	7	5	
Garrett	56	0.6%	5	0	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	2	
Harford	289	3.1%	1	1	55	26	1	4	3	15	2	6	4	3	132	5	1	2	1	1	0	4	0	4	2	0	8	8	
Howard	85	0.9%	0	4	17	11	0	0	3	1	0	0	6	1	1	24	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	4	
Kent	21	0.2%	0	0	3	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	
Montgomery	727	7.8%	24	10	57	25	2	4	11	3	6	7	31	14	5	8	0	401	54	0	2	0	0	18	1	0	30	14	
Prince George's	808	8.6%	16	30	69	25	9	2	7	3	20	18	18	16	2	7	0	51	436	0	1	1	0	15	0	0	42	20	
Queen Anne's	34	0.4%	3	4	6	1	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	0	0	3	1	1	0	1	0	
Somerset	57	0.6%	1	0	7	4	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	1	15	1	2	2	
St. Mary's	172	1.8%	8	1	15	11	4	0	0	1	20	0	4	2	3	0	0	6	21	0	0	62	0	1	0	0	7	6	
Talbot	48	0.5%	4	0	6	3	0	4	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	20	0	1	4	0	0	0	
Washington	246	2.6%	14	0	16	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	6	2	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	171	1	0	4	5	
Wicomico	121	1.3%	5	2	12	8	0	2	0	0	0	17	3	3	1	1	5	3	0	1	2	0	4	5	40	2	4	1	
Worcester	54	0.6%	2	1	8	3	0	2	1	0	0	5	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	3	0	1	0	14	8	2	1	
OOS	57	0.6%	5	3	21	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	7	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	7	0	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	9373	100.0%	264	312	1929	2769	75	52	142	119	135	151	255	140	285	126	25	554	738	19	40	81	32	321	93	12	339	365	
% of placements from jurisdiction			73.0%	36.8%	49.7%	52.2%	50.5%	25.5%	45.7%	53.4%	40.3%	55.8%	50.9%	53.6%	45.7%	28.2%	47.6%	55.2%	54.0%	26.5%	35.1%	36.0%	41.7%	69.5%	33.1%	14.8%	12.3%	0.0%	
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			2.8%	3.3%	20.6%	29.5%	0.8%	0.6%	1.5%	1.3%	1.4%	1.6%	2.7%	1.5%	3.0%	1.3%	0.3%	5.9%	7.9%	0.2%	0.4%	0.9%	0.3%	3.4%	1.0%	0.1%	3.6%	3.9%	

Table 9: All Out-of-Home Placements: Number of Placements 1/31/2011

In keeping with the best practice of placing children in the least restrictive environment, placing agencies attempt to place children in their jurisdictions of origin or in nearby jurisdictions whenever possible, taking into account the availability of services that each child needs. This chart illustrates that the majority of children in placement are placed in their home jurisdictions, based on the 2011 one-day census. By placing children close to their homes, they continue to have access to positive social and cultural connections, continuity in educational services, and are more likely to cultivate and repair relationships with family members who serve as the child’s safety net.

Out-of-State (OOS) Placements





Chart 7/Table 10: One-Day Count- All Agencies All Categories OOS Trends

Out-of-State placement has been decreasing since 2009, largely due to the efforts of local and Statewide teams that try to get children the services they need within the State of Maryland. Sometimes children are placed out-of-State when the placement is with a relative who is willing to care for them or when there are no services within the State to meet the child’s level of need. Non-community-based placements have seen a slight increase in the most recent year because these placements are among the highest intensity and some very specialized services are only available outside of Maryland.

A number of teams assist families to assess these options and to decide what is best for the child being placed. Regional Care Management Entities (CMEs) and Local Care Teams (LCTs) are available to provide families with information about services and to coordinate a multidisciplinary approach when necessary. For any child who is referred to out-of-State placement, the State Coordinating Council (SCC), composed of representatives from each of the Children’s Cabinet Agencies, provides a review to ensure that the placement is necessary to meet the needs of the child.

Note: The SCC may not change the residential placement of a child placed by a local school system through the Individualized Education Program (IEP) Team process. Only the IEP Team, including the parent, has the authority to approve the placement based on the individual needs of the child. The SCC also may not change the services covered and authorized under the Maryland Medical Assistance Program if the child is eligible for Medical Assistance under Health-General Article, Title 15, Annotated Code of Maryland.

Overall Costs associated with OOHP




All Agencies All Categories Total Cost Trends				Percent Change	
Category	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Community-Based Residential Placement	\$189,084,441	\$149,949,735	\$127,964,381	-20.7%	-14.7%
Family Home Settings	\$150,503,515	\$153,746,388	\$136,174,495	2.2%	-11.4%
Hospitalization	\$196,350	\$266,698	\$270,091	35.8%	1.3%
Non-Community-Based Residential Placement	\$200,917,765	\$189,570,331	\$199,411,359	-5.6%	5.2%
All Categories	\$540,702,071	\$493,533,152	\$463,820,326	-8.7%	-6.0%

Chart 8/Table 11: FY Cost Trends by Placement Category

The costs of out-of-home placement have decreased from \$540 million in FY2009 to \$463 million in FY2011 (Chart8/Table 11, page 19). This is a 14% reduction from FY2009 to


FY2011 and is supported by efforts to keep children in their own homes through Intensive Family Preservation Services, youth community interventions and wraparound services, and placing children in kinship care. The largest decrease in costs has been in community-based placements.



All Agencies All Categories Cost Per Bed-Day Trends				Percent Change	
Category	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Community-Based Residential Placement	\$256	\$231	\$217	-9.8%	-6.1%
Family Home Settings	\$88	\$93	\$89	5.7%	-4.3%
Hospitalization	\$721	\$730	\$739	1.2%	1.2%
Non-Community-Based Residential Placement	\$438	\$460	\$469	5.0%	2.0%
All Categories	\$183	\$179	\$181	-2.2%	1.1%

Chart 9/Table 12: FY Bed-Day Cost Trends by Placement Category

The cost per bed-day shows the cost of each placement based on one day units. While hospitalization is the least utilized category, with only 43 placements counted during the one-day census of 2011, that category represents less than 1% of total placements. While it is also clearly the most expensive form of placement based on the daily rate per child, it accounts for less than one hundredth of one percent of total placement costs. The cost of community-based placement has steadily decreased from \$256 to \$217 per bed-day, while the costs of non-community-based placements have recently increased. Cost changes can be attributed to rising inflation and varying amount of services being utilized for any given child in placement.



Placement Cost By Agency, 1/31/2011	
Agency	Cost
ADAA	\$46,828,362
DDA	\$4,575,474
DHR	\$225,439,051
DJS	\$76,201,531
MHA	\$102,355,279
MSDE	\$8,420,629

Chart 10/Table 13: Placement Cost by Agency 1-31/2011

As illustrated above, DHR places the majority of children – 81%. However, only 49% of total placement costs are attributable to DHR. There are two primary reasons for this. One is that DHR placements are primarily family home placements, 76% of DHR placements, followed by community-based placements at 15%, and these two categories are the least expensive placement categories per bed-day. The second reason is that a number of DHR placements, as well as those of other agencies, are into residential treatment centers (RTCs) which are billed to Medicaid. Those Medicaid-billed placements are counted under MHA as the children in RTCs are accessing mental health services. The costs of placement per agency are dependent on the types of services and placements in which each agency specializes.

Agency Overviews

91.0% of the total population of children in out-of-home placement during FY2011 was placed by DHR and DJS. In an effort to meet the needs of the children they serve, both agencies have developed an out-of-home placement overview reporting the overall trends in placement and costs as well as highlights of the key initiatives associated with out-of-home placement.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES (DHR) OVERVIEW

DHR is committed to ensuring safety, well-being, and permanency for children. Family, child/youth, and community involvement are the foundation of the Family-Centered Practice model, and the desire to keep children and youth close to their families and communities is the guiding principle of the Place Matters Initiative.

The goals of the Place Matters Initiative are to:

- **Keep children in families first** - Place more children who enter care with relatives or in resource families as appropriate and decrease the numbers of children in congregate care.
- **Maintain children in their communities** - Keep children at home with their families and offer more services in their communities, across all levels of care.
- **Reduce reliance on out-of-home care** - Provide more in-home supports to help maintain children in their families.
- **Minimize the length of stay** - Reduce length of stay in out-of-home care and increase reunification.
- **Manage with data and redirect resources** - Ensure that managers have relevant data to improve decision-making, oversight, and accountability. Shift resources from the back-end to the front-end of services.

As of August 2011, the Place Matters values and practices have resulted in a 28% reduction in the number of children in out-of-home care since July 2007.²

Population Totals:




Chart 11: DHR Placements by Category 1/31/2011

² End of month July 2007 = 10,248; end of month August 2011 = 7,316; calculations – DHR/SSA; DHR State Stat file –01-DHR SSA Vol III No 42 – August 2011.

DHR Placements by Category, 1/31/2011	
Category	Placements
Community-Based Residential Placement	1,170
Family Home Settings	5,765
Hospitalization	38
Non-Community-Based Residential Placement	306
Placement Category Not Available (Unknown)*	336

Table 14: DHR Placements by Category 1/31/2011

*Placement Category Not Available – data not available in reportable/extractable format from MD CHESSIE


One-Day Count Analysis (1/31/2011)

Consistent with DHR policy and values, 76% of all DHR placements on January 31, 2011 were in family home settings. Family home settings including pre-adoptive placements, foster care homes (including treatment foster care), trial home visits, kinship/relative placements, and youth who are living in their own home/apartments. DHR’s priority is to always place children/youth in family home settings, preferably with their own family/relatives, whenever safe and possible to do so.

Community-based settings include group homes (Residential Child Care Programs), independent living programs, and other placements such as college and Job Corps. Please note that “community-based settings” include group homes as well as several other categories, so direct comparisons to data based on this categorization cannot be made to DHR’s Place Matters data, which measures placements in group homes only. Children and youth in community-based placements constitute 15% of all DHR placements.

Children/youth in non-community-based placements (RTCs, secure detention facilities, and correctional institutions) constitute 4% of the total DHR out-of-home population, while children/youth in hospitalizations (medical and psychiatric) constitute less than 1%.

Placement Category Not Available - A small portion of placements (4%) were not able to be categorized, because the placement data for these children was entered in MD CHESSIE in a text format, which is not extractable in an aggregate report. That is, placement data was entered under a category of “other” with a text description of the placement type; while that data is part of the official child record, and DHR can easily access that information, child by child, it is not able to be analyzed for aggregate reports. These placement types are not known to have any similarities as a group other than the data entry error. DHR is working to correct these data entry issues so that all placement data may be aggregated in future reports.



DHR All Categories Placement Trends				Percent Change	
Category	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Community-Based Residential Placement	1,649	1,321	1,170	-19.9%	-11.4%
Family Home Settings	6,672	6,397	5,765	-4.1%	-9.9%
Hospitalization	21	23	38	9.5%	65.2%
Non-Community-Based Residential Placement	335	339	306	1.2%	-9.7%
Placement Category Not Available	251	435	336	73.3%	-22.8%
All Categories	8,928	8,515	7,615	-4.6%	-10.6%

Chart 12/Table 15: DHR One-Day Count Placement Category Trends

Overall, the one-day DHR out-of-home population has decreased 15% from 2009 to 2011. During this reduction, children have remained safe from further abuse and neglect. Maltreatment recurrence within six months has ranged from 3.2% to 4.6%, well under the federal standard of 5.4%.³ Maryland's absence of abuse and neglect while in foster care is at 99.77% and has also remained above the federal standard (99.68% or higher).⁴

Additionally, children have remained in stable placements. Current data shows that placement stability, measured as the percentage of children with two or fewer placement settings within the first 12 months of removal from home, is 85%. This is just slightly under the national 75th percentile of 86%.⁵

³ *Maryland Child Welfare Performance Indicators – 4th Annual Child Welfare Accountability Report*, Terry Shaw and Haksoon Ahn, Ruth H. Young Center for Families and Children, University of Maryland School of Social Work, December 2010, page 10.

⁴ DHR State Stat file –01-DHR SSA Vol III No 42 – August 2011.

⁵ DHR State Stat file –01-DHR SSA Vol III No 42 – August 2011.

Population Flow:

DHR Placement Population Flow - All Placements (count of placements, not children)					
State Fiscal Year	Placements at Start of FY	Starts in FY (New Placements)	Total Served	Ends in FY (Placement Exits)	Placements at End of FY
2009	9,363	12,050	21,413	12,728	8,685
2010	8,685	12,057	20,742	12,789	7,953
2011	7,953	11,817	19,770	12,261	7,509
Three Year Change	-15.1%	-1.9%	-7.7%	-3.7%	-13.5%
Average Yearly Change	-7.5%	-1.0%	-3.8%	-1.8%	-6.8%
Recent Year Change	-8.4%	-2.0%	-4.7%	-4.1%	-5.6%

Table 16: DHR FY Placement Population Flow

The total DHR out-of-home population continues to decrease. Lower numbers are seen each year in all DHR FY placement population flow points, including total served and end of the fiscal year. It is important to note that the table above represents counts of new placements, including placement changes – not counts of children – and therefore has limited ability to present an overall analysis of the Population Flow of DHR’s out-of-home population in terms of removals from home and exit from DSS custody. In FY2011, there were 3,329 children/youth who entered DHR out-of-home care (*i.e.*, were removed from their homes) and 3,926 who exited from DSS custody.⁶

⁶ DHR State Stat file –01-DHR SSA Vol III No 42 – August 2011.

DHR Placement Population Flow - By Category							
	FY	Community- Based	Family Home Settings	Hospitalization	Non- Community- Based	Not Available	All Categories
Placements (Children) at beginning of FY							
Numbers	2009	1,660	6,891	24	313	475	9,363
	2010	1,422	6,673	35	353	202	8,685
	2011	1,254	6,104	18	319	258	7,953
Percentage of Total Placements	2009	17.7%	73.6%	0.3%	3.3%	5.1%	100.0%
	2010	16.4%	76.8%	0.4%	4.1%	2.3%	100.0%
	2011	15.8%	76.8%	0.2%	4.0%	3.2%	100.0%
Entries during FY (Count of placements, not children)							
Numbers	2009	2,616	8,204	229	419	582	12,050
	2010	2,170	8,837	202	478	370	12,057
	2011	2,063	8,460	190	475	629	11,817
Percentage of Total Placements	2009	21.7%	68.1%	1.9%	3.5%	4.8%	100.0%
	2010	18.0%	73.3%	1.7%	4.0%	3.1%	100.0%
	2011	17.5%	71.6%	1.6%	4.0%	5.3%	100.0%
Served during FY (Count of placements, not children)							
Numbers	2009	4,276	15,095	253	732	1,057	21,413
	2010	3,592	15,510	237	831	572	20,742
	2011	3,317	14,564	208	794	887	19,770
Percentage of Total Placements	2009	20.0%	70.5%	1.2%	3.4%	4.9%	100.0%
	2010	17.3%	74.8%	1.1%	4.0%	2.8%	100.0%
	2011	16.8%	73.7%	1.1%	4.0%	4.5%	100.0%
Exits during FY (Count of placements, not children)							
Numbers	2009	2,854	8,422	218	379	855	12,728
	2010	2,338	9,406	219	512	314	12,789
	2011	2,188	8,954	178	490	451	12,261
Percentage of Total Placements	2009	22.4%	66.2%	1.7%	3.0%	6.7%	100.0%
	2010	18.3%	73.5%	1.7%	4.0%	2.5%	100.0%
	2011	17.8%	73.0%	1.5%	4.0%	3.7%	100.0%
Placements (Children) at end of FY							
Numbers	2009	1,422	6,673	35	353	202	8,685
	2010	1,254	6,104	18	319	258	7,953
	2011	1,129	5,610	30	304	436	7,509
Percentage of Total Placements	2009	16.4%	76.8%	0.4%	4.1%	2.3%	100.0%
	2010	15.8%	76.8%	0.2%	4.0%	3.2%	100.0%
	2011	15.0%	74.7%	0.4%	4.0%	5.8%	100.0%

Table 17: DHR FY Placement Population Flow by Category

Jurisdiction	Est. Pop Under 18	Average # of OOH children, under age 18, Apr-May-Jun 2011	Placement Rate, per 1,000 under 18*
Allegany	13,048	82	6.26
Anne Arundel	123,600	117	0.95
Baltimore City	152,150	3005	19.75
Baltimore	176,013	439	2.49
Calvert	21,766	83	3.80
Caroline	8,222	37	4.54
Carroll	40,652	34	0.84
Cecil	24,554	119	4.83
Charles	36,974	76	2.06
Dorchester	6,865	14	1.99
Frederick	58,469	124	2.12
Garrett	6,312	29	4.54
Harford	59,354	226	3.81
Howard	69,381	49	0.71
Kent	3,836	7	1.74
Montgomery	233,762	414	1.77
Prince George's	199,355	450	2.26
Queen Anne's	10,982	13	1.21
St. Mary's	26,895	146	5.42
Somerset	4,730	44	9.23
Talbot	7,171	20	2.74
Washington	33,556	200	5.95
Wicomico	22,304	38	1.72
Worcester	9,274	30	3.23
Total	1,349,225	5,794	4.29
Sources:	Casey Family Program	MD CHESSIE	


Table 18: DHR Placement Rate
**Currently in OOH care, not entry rate*

Of all Maryland jurisdictions, Baltimore City has the highest rate of out-of-home placements, followed by Somerset, Allegany, Washington, and St. Mary's Counties. The lowest rates, less than 1 per 1,000, are attributed to Howard, Carroll, and Anne Arundel Counties. Baltimore

City's high placement rate, large population, and subsequent large number of children in out-of-home care drive many of Maryland's child welfare indicators and measures, including the breakdown of children in care by race.

After focusing the last several years on an overall reduction in the total number of children in out-of-home care, DHR is now asking LDSSs with the highest out-of-home placement rate to make the largest reductions in out-of-home numbers. The reduction target for FY 2012 is 10% of end of fiscal year 2011 population. Jurisdictions with the lowest placement rates, up to 1.8 per 1,000, will not be asked to make further reductions in their out-of-home populations, as those jurisdictions appear to have reached a point where further reductions could elevate risk of harm to some children. Jurisdictions with rates between 1.8 and 4.7 per 1,000 will be asked to reduce their total out-of-home population by either 3% or 8%. This targeted approach will help the State deploy resources and make reductions where they are most needed while ensuring the safety of all children.

Demographics:



DHR All Categories Age Trends				Percent Change	
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
0 through 5	2,121	1,952	1,647	-8.0%	-15.6%
6 through 11	1,773	1,516	1,245	-14.5%	-17.9%
12 through 17	3,381	3,201	2,784	-5.3%	-13.0%
18 and over	1,653	1,846	1,939	11.7%	5.0%
Total	8,928	8,515	7,615	-4.6%	-10.6%

Chart 13/Table 19: DHR One-Day Count All Category Age Trends




Chart 14: Distribution of Age Groups and Placement Categories 1/31/2011


Of the children/youth in DHR out-of-home care:

- 37% are ages 12 through 17
- 25% are ages 18 and over
- 22% are ages 5 and under
- 16% are ages 6 through 11

DHR encourages youth turning 18 who have not exited foster care to reunification, guardianship, or adoption, to remain in care until their 21st birthday, to continue to receive placement and support services. Maryland was the first state in the nation to have an approved federal IV-E⁷ plan that includes youth up to age 21.

A majority of children/youth in all age groups are placed in family home settings, although the number of youth in other types of placements increases in each older age group.

⁷ Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, Federal Payments for Foster Care and Adoption Assistance.




DHR All Categories Gender Trends				Percent Change	
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Male	4,674	4,388	3,922	-6.1%	-10.6%
Female	4,254	4,127	3,692	-3.0%	-10.5%
Unknown*	0	0	1	NA	NA
Total	8,928	8,515	7,615	-4.6%	-10.6%

Chart 15/Table 20: DHR One-Day Count All Categories Gender Trends

*Unknown = gender not identified in the child's MD CHESIE record.

DHR's out-of-home population is traditionally fairly evenly split along gender lines. As of January 31, 2011, 52% of children in care were male, and 48% of children were female. Gender equality is seen most in DHR's family home settings, which constitute the majority of all DHR placements.



DHR All Categories Race Trends				Percent Change	
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
American Indian / Alaskan	10	7	4	-30.0%	-42.9%
Asian	23	23	24	0.0%	4.3%
Black or African American	6,461	6,085	5,270	-5.8%	-13.4%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	3	5	3	66.7%	-40.0%
White	1,917	1,843	1,792	-3.9%	-2.8%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	302	309	278	2.3%	-10.0%
Other	118	137	139	16.1%	1.5%
Unknown*	94	106	105	12.8%	-0.9%
Total	8,928	8,515	7,615	-4.6%	-10.6%

Chart 16/Table 21: DHR One-Day Count All Categories Race Trends
 *Unknown = race not identified in the child's MD CHESSIE record.

A majority of children and youth in DHR out-of-home care are Black/African-American (69%). The next largest significant racial group is White children/youth (24%) with other racial groups constituting 7% of the total out-of-home population.


Placement by Jurisdiction:

DHR: All Placement Categories and Subcategories																												
Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Placement Jurisdiction																									
			Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	109	1.4%	85	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	13	2	
Anne Arundel	153	2.0%	0	76	22	10	0	3	1	1	7	1	1	0	2	1	1	4	7	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	10	2
Baltimore	555	7.3%	1	14	336	75	0	0	7	6	0	3	4	1	36	12	0	7	14	0	2	1	0	3	1	1	11	20
Baltimore City	4190	55.0%	6	101	1020	2322	2	1	16	4	8	6	10	4	85	58	0	15	150	0	9	6	1	15	2	0	83	266
Calvert	76	1.0%	0	3	3	2	47	1	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	2	
Caroline	33	0.4%	0	0	3	0	0	12	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	
Carroll	38	0.5%	0	0	5	1	0	0	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	
Cecil	117	1.5%	0	2	17	3	0	1	0	78	0	2	2	0	4	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	2	2	
Charles	111	1.5%	1	0	10	2	7	0	0	0	61	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	
Dorchester	25	0.3%	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	1	1	
Frederick	158	2.1%	1	1	6	3	0	2	3	1	0	0	80	0	1	2	0	7	7	0	0	0	33	0	0	6	5	
Garrett	47	0.6%	2	0	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	2	
Harford	255	3.3%	0	1	47	19	1	3	1	15	2	2	1	2	130	5	0	1	1	0	4	0	3	2	0	7	8	
Howard	65	0.9%	0	3	15	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	1	1	17	0	0	6	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	4	
Kent	10	0.1%	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Montgomery	518	6.8%	0	6	43	12	2	0	6	2	6	0	20	7	3	6	0	310	52	0	2	0	13	1	0	13	14	
Prince George's	605	7.9%	1	13	43	15	9	1	1	2	19	3	1	0	2	7	0	29	419	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	17	20
Queen Anne's	19	0.2%	0	1	5	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Somerset	49	0.6%	1	0	6	1	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	14	1	2	2	
St. Mary's	141	1.9%	0	0	11	5	4	0	0	1	20	0	0	0	3	0	4	21	0	0	60	0	0	0	0	0	6	6
Talbot	36	0.5%	0	0	4	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	19	0	4	0	0	0	
Washington	195	2.6%	1	0	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	159	1	0	3	5	
Wicomico	70	0.9%	0	0	4	3	0	2	0	0	0	11	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	1	2	0	0	36	2	3	1	
Worcester	37	0.5%	0	0	5	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	13	8	2	1	
OOS	3	0.0%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Grand Total	7615	100.0%	99	222	1624	2493	72	36	61	110	129	59	126	53	270	112	11	385	710	18	38	73	21	241	87	12	188	365
% of placements from jurisdiction			78.0%	49.7%	60.5%	55.4%	61.8%	36.4%	63.2%	66.7%	55.0%	56.0%	50.6%	63.8%	51.0%	26.2%	70.0%	59.8%	69.3%	42.1%	36.7%	42.6%	52.8%	81.5%	51.4%	21.6%	0.0%	0.0%
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			1.3%	2.9%	21.3%	32.7%	0.9%	0.5%	0.8%	1.4%	1.7%	0.8%	1.7%	0.7%	3.5%	1.5%	0.1%	5.1%	9.3%	0.2%	0.5%	1.0%	0.3%	3.2%	1.1%	0.2%	2.5%	4.8%

Table 22: DHR All Placement Category and Subcategory

One of the primary goals of Place Matters is to ensure that children are placed in their home or adjacent jurisdiction, and in FY2011, approximately 69% of children/youth were so placed.⁸ The table above shows that on January 31, 2011, approximately 57% of all children/youth were placed in their home jurisdiction. Each of Maryland’s LDSSs with the highest out-of-home populations (Baltimore City and Baltimore, Montgomery, and Prince George’s Counties) had over 50% of their children placed within their home jurisdiction.

Placement jurisdictions listed as “unknown” are those for which the full placement address was not entered correctly into MD CHESSIE and/or which the jurisdiction of placement was not able to be identified through GIS analysis.




DHR Out of State All Categories Placement Trends				Percent Change	
Category	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Community-Based Residential Placement	67	48	45	-28.4%	-6.3%
Family Home Settings	237	187	141	-21.1%	-24.6%
Hospitalization	0	0	0	NA	NA
Non-Community-Based Residential Placement	0	0	1	NA	NA
Placement Category Not Available	0	3	1	NA	-66.7%
All Categories	304	238	188	-21.7%	-21.0%

Chart 17/Table 23: DHR Out-of-State All Categories Placement Trends

Out-of-State placements constitute a small percentage of all DHR placements, and have decreased each year in both community-based and family home placements.

⁸ DHR State Stat file –01-DHR SSA Vol III No 42 – August 2011.


Placement Costs:



DHR Cost Trends				Percent Change	
Cost Type	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Total Cost	\$301,566,171	\$264,644,544	\$225,439,051	-12.2%	-14.8%
Residential Cost	\$301,566,171	\$264,644,544	\$225,439,051	-12.2%	-14.8%
Educational Cost	\$0	\$0	\$0	NA	NA
Administrative Cost	\$0	\$0	\$0	NA	NA
% Residential	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
% Educational	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
% Administrative	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		

Chart 18/Table 24: DHR Cost Trends

For the past two years, DHR placement costs have decreased. FY2011’s placement costs are below those of FY2009. These costs have decreased primarily due to the reduction in the DHR out-of-home population.




DHR All Categories Total Cost Trends				Percent Change	
Category	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Community-Based Residential Placement	\$156,230,898	\$115,833,311	\$93,862,100	-25.9%	-19.0%
Family Home Settings	\$145,335,273	\$148,811,233	\$131,576,951	2.4%	-11.6%
Hospitalization	\$0	\$0	\$0	NA	NA
Non-Community-Based Residential Placement	\$0	\$0	\$0	NA	NA
Placement Category Not Available	\$0	\$0	\$0	NA	NA
All Categories	\$301,566,171	\$264,644,544	\$225,439,051	-12.2%	-14.8%

Chart 19/Table 25: DHR Cost Trends by Placement Category

In FY2010, the total number of children served in family home settings was higher than either FY2009 or FY2011, and, correspondingly, the costs for family home settings in FY2010 were higher than in either FY2009 or FY2011. Costs for community-based residential placements have continued to decrease over the past three fiscal years. Despite the increase in the family home settings costs during FY2010, total placement costs have decreased each fiscal year since FY2009.

DHR does not fund non-community-based residential placements, which are typically funded by Medicaid or a co-lead agency. Hospitalizations are funded by Medicaid.



DHR All Categories Cost Per Bed-Day Trends				Percent Change	
Category	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Community-Based Residential Placement	\$281	\$250	\$229	-11.0%	-8.4%
Family Home Settings	\$86	\$92	\$88	7.0%	-4.3%
Hospitalization	\$0	\$0	\$0	NA	NA
Non-Community-Based Residential Placement	\$0	\$0	\$0	NA	NA
Placement Category Not Available	\$0	\$0	\$0	NA	NA
All Categories	\$135	\$127	\$118	-5.9%	-7.1%

Chart 20/Table 26: DHR Cost Per Bed-Day Trends by Placement Category

Community-based residential placement per bed-day costs have decreased each fiscal year since 2009, although there was an increase in FY2010 for family home placements per bed-day costs.

Conclusions:

Resource Development

1. **Needs - Maryland continues to need resource parents for teens, sibling groups, and medically fragile children.** Though gains have been made in these areas, especially through educating current resource parents, resource parents for these populations remain the most needed. Recruitment of minority resource parents, in particular Spanish-speaking parents, continues. In many cases, the potential resource parents who respond to outreach efforts are interested in younger children or children solely available for adoption.

2. Services and Initiatives – Resource Development

- a. **Guardianship Assistance Program** (formerly titled “Subsidized Guardianship Program”). By removing financial barriers, this program encourages relative caregivers to become legal guardians of children who have been placed in their home by the LDSS.
- b. **The Adoption Program** includes initiatives such as dual approval of resource homes; open adoption when it is in the child’s best interest; Statewide recruitment of resource homes; the Maryland Voluntary Adoption Registry; the Adoption Search, Contact and Reunion Services (ASCRS) Program; the Maryland Adoption Resource Exchange (MARE) Program; Recruitment Program; the Post-Adoption Permanency Program; the Adoption Assistance Subsidy Program; Title XX Child Care Reimbursement; and the Non-recurring Adoption Expenses reimbursement.
- c. **The Transitioning Youth to Families Initiative** was developed to identify youth in congregate care settings who are ready to transition to families with an emphasis on biological families. The initiative provides a mechanism to standardize procedures for identifying and accessing the most appropriate placement consistent with the best interests and needs of the child. In FY2011, staff focused efforts on medically fragile children placed in group facilities. Treatment foster care providers were engaged in the assessment of these children’s needs to identify families able and willing to provide care.
- d. **The State is also focusing attention on the proportion of children placed in group homes, family homes, and especially in Treatment Foster Care (TFC).** During the last two years, the proportion of children placed in regular family homes has decreased, from 29% to 27%, and the proportion in TFC has increased from 24% to 27%. Accordingly, Maryland’s efforts in the upcoming years will be focused on providing public home placements rather than treatment placements.⁹

3. Services and Initiatives - Support to and Engagement of Families and Youth

- a. **Family-Centered Practice (FCP)** is Maryland’s child welfare service delivery model that centers on the active and meaningful engagement of all parties in a child’s life to improve outcomes for that child and family. Priorities are engagement of the family and child in the case planning process, strengthening our community partnerships and resources available for our families, and gathering information to improve the quality of services offered through the child welfare continuum. Special emphasis is placed on strategies to involve fathers, paternal kin, and incarcerated parents.
- b. **Family Involvement Meetings (FIMs)** are critical in FCP. A FIM is a forum for families to be active partners in the decision-making process for their child at key points along the child welfare continuum. The triggers defined for FIM are: removal/considered removal, placement change, recommendation for permanency plan change, youth transition plan, and voluntary placement. All LDSSs are conducting FIMs at the designated triggers.

⁹ *Maryland Department of Human Resources Title IV-B Child and Family Services Plan – 2011 Annual Progress and Services Report*, June 30, 2011, page 25.

- c. **Youth Engagement Model** - SSA is in the final months of implementing a grant awarded by the Administration on Children and Families Atlantic Coast of Child Welfare Implementation Center (ACCWIC).
- d. **Independent Living Services (ILS)** provide independent living preparation services to older youth in foster care 14 to 21 years of age in preparation for adulthood. The goal of the program is to assist youth to make a successful transition from out-of-home placement to self-sufficiency. Services include, but are not limited to, financial and educational support, employment preparation, life skills training, social support, and planning for health care needs.

4. **Related SSA Offices**

- a. **Resource Development and Retention** is responsible for services related to the recruitment and retention of resource families, including providing technical assistance to the LDSSs in development of their local recruitment plans.
- b. **Placement and Support Services** is responsible for the development of supportive services for Maryland's children, families, and resource homes. This unit works with stakeholders to identify and develop strategies to improve the array of services available to support children and families in achieving safety, permanence and well-being. The services include education, substance abuse treatment, health care, and mental health. This unit works closely with the DHR's Office of Licensing and Monitoring (OLM) which is responsible for the monitoring of Maryland licensed child placement agencies and residential treatment programs.
- c. **Child Welfare Training** oversees the training for all child welfare staff in Maryland by monitoring the contract and coordinating the training activities with the University of Maryland School of Social Work/ Child Welfare Academy. In conjunction with the Child Welfare Academy, this office coordinates pre-service training for all new LDSS staff and continuing education opportunities for existing LDSS staff in addition to training the public foster care providers.
- d. **Child Welfare Organizational Development** is responsible for supporting new initiatives that advance the overall strategic mission of the SSA and coordinating technical assistance to LDSSs for emerging practices.

5. **Partnerships**

- a. **The Annie E. Casey Foundation** has provided technical assistance in the identification of and strategies to overcome barriers to permanency.
- b. **Casey Family Programs** has assisted in the development and implementation of the supervision model.
- c. **Children's Research Center** is assisting in the revision of DHR's safety and risk assessment tools.
- d. **Providers Advisory Council** has representation from both Residential Child Care agencies and child placement agencies and is co-chaired by the SSA and the OLM. The Council meets monthly with the Secretary of DHR and the Executive Director of SSA. The Council provides consultation to DHR in matters pertaining to services to children, and policy relating to payment services, health, safety and well-being.

- e. **Maryland Foster Parent Association (MFPA)** partners with the State to serve and educate Maryland's resource parents. There is a Foster Parent Ombudsman on the staff of the Secretary of DHR to work closely with the MFPA to resolve concerns and issues.
- f. **Family Unification Program (FUP)** is a collaborative effort between the Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) and DHR to provide adequate housing to promote family unification. FUP provides Housing Choice Vouchers to assist families with children in out-of-home care who have not been able to reunify with their children due to lack of permanent and adequate housing, families displaced by domestic violence in preventing the unnecessary removal of children from their families, and eligible youth formerly in foster care.
- g. **Regional Care Management Entities** serve multiple populations of children/youth, including those eligible for the 1915(c) Psychiatric Residential Treatment Facility Waiver (RTC Waiver), the Systems of Care Grants (MD CARES and Rural CARES), and other Children's Cabinet Interagency Fund (CCIF) initiatives (DHR Group Home Diversion and DJS Out-of-Home Placement Diversion) to support children/youth and their families in their homes and communities. The CMEs operate Statewide, in three regions (Baltimore City Region, the South Eastern Region, and the North Western Region).
- h. **Maryland KEEP** is a collaboration among the MFPA and the University of Maryland/ School of Social Work/ Ruth Young Center and Child Welfare Training Academy, and the Oregon Social Learning Center (OSLC). KEEP is a foster and kinship parent training and support intervention for children/youth ages 5 to 12, designed by Dr. Patricia Chamberlain and the OSLC, modeled after the evidence-based practice of Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care. KEEP is an intervention to:
 - improve the recruitment and retention of foster care parents by strengthening the network of foster care families;
 - decrease child behavior problems;
 - decrease placement disruptions; and
 - increase permanency for children/youth by removing the barriers of multiple placements.

Conclusion & Recommendations

DHR has made significant reductions in the number of children in DHR out-of-home care since the initiation of Place Matters in July 2007. The Family-Centered Practices model and other strategies continue to support these efforts. The reduction in the out-of-home population has been achieved while continuing to keep children safe and in stable placements.

Approximately 76% of all children in DHR out-of-home care are placed in family homes and 15% are in community-based settings. These proportions are consistent with Place Matters values of keeping children in family homes. Data also indicates that over 50% of children are placed in their home jurisdiction, with a total of nearly 70% placed in their home or adjacent jurisdiction. This reflects the values of Place Matters in keeping children close to their homes in order to maintain their ties with their communities and allow for easier travel for family visitation.

The total out-of-home placement rate is 4.29 per 1,000, with Baltimore City having the highest rate, at 19.75 per 1,000. DHR is implementing new out-of-home placement reduction goals based on the placement per population rate with those LDSSs with the highest rates expected to reduce their out-of-home populations by 10% in the current fiscal year. LDSSs with the lowest placement rates will not be expected to reduce their out-of-home population any further, as this could potentially place some children at risk for harm. This targeted approach will allow DHR to focus resources and attention on areas with the greatest need.

37% of children ages 12 through 17 constitute the largest age group in DHR out-of-home care, and African-American children/youth constitute approximately 69% of all children placed out-of-home. The proportions of males and females are nearly equal.


The total DHR population has continued to decrease and is at the lowest point in several years. Placement costs have decreased for the second consecutive year.

Placement needs are highest for children with special needs and older youth. Current efforts by DHR and child welfare stakeholders to address these needs should be continued and expanded. DHR will continue to look for alternatives to congregate (group home) placements when appropriate for specific children, and will increase efforts to place children in public foster care homes rather than treatment foster care homes, whenever possible. Statewide efforts to provide wraparound and supportive services to children with intensive needs should be continued.

DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE SERVICES (DJS) OVERVIEW

The data given for DJS placements only includes youth who are placed in either in-State or out-of-State committed programs. All committed youth are adjudicated delinquent and committed to the custody of DJS by the juvenile court. A continuum of out-of-home placement options has been developed for these youth, ranging from placement in a foster care setting to placement in a secure confinement facility. The cost data reported under each section also reflects only youth in committed placements. “Non-committed” DJS youth, who are not adjudicated or placed by the juvenile court, are not represented in the placement totals and placement costs in this Report.

Population Totals:




DJS Placements by category, 1/31/2011	
Category	Placements
Community-Based Residential Placement	237
Family Home Settings	75
Hospitalization	5
Non-Community-Based Residential Placement	630
Placement Category Not Available	0

Chart 21/Table 27: DJS Placements by Category, 1/31/2011

DJS youth are represented in all categories of placement: family home settings, community-based residential placement, non-community-based residential placement, and hospitalization. As of 1/31/2011, of the 947 total youth placed out-of-home, non-community-based placements constitute approximately about two-thirds or 67%. This category includes youth admitted to RTCs and hardware and staff-secure programs. Most of DJS’ hardware secure programs are contracted through out-of-State vendors with the exception of two State operated programs, *i.e.*, Victor Cullen Center for males and Waxter Children’s Center for females. The majority of youth placed in staff-secure programs are from Youth Centers and a few others are from out-of-State private vendors. DJS has RTC programs both in-State and out-of-State. Because DJS uses

RTCs, the hospitalization category includes only youth who are admitted for emergency care for a mental health disorder. This is the least-used category. Community-based residential placements are utilized for less serious offenders and include group homes and therapeutic group homes. As of 1/31/2011, 25% of the total 947 youth were in a community-based setting. Family home settings include foster care and therapeutic foster care. Approximately 8% were in family settings.



DJS All Categories Placement Trends				Percent Change	
Category	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Community-Based Residential Placement	238	268	237	12.6%	-11.6%
Family Home Settings	83	93	75	12.0%	-19.4%
Hospitalization	8	8	5	0.0%	-37.5%
Non-Community-Based Residential Placement	556	562	630	1.1%	12.1%
Placement Category Not Available	0	0	0	NA	NA
All Categories	885	931	947	5.2%	1.7%

Chart 22/Table 28: DJS One-Day Count Placement Trends

Although one-day counts are subject to change during the fiscal year, they can still provide an overall trend over the years. Reviewing the above three years of one-day trend counts, it is clear that there has been an increase in non-community-based residential placements from 2009 to 2011. While the overall increase between 1/31/2010 and 1/31/2011 was only 1.7%, the non-community-based population increased by 12%. All other category counts decreased between these two points. The community based population increased by 12.6% between 1/31/2009 and 1/31/2010, but decreased by 11.6% between 1/31/2010 and 1/31/2011. The increase in non-community-based residential placement can be associated with the development and use of the Maryland Comprehensive Assessment and Service Planning (MCASP) assessment tool implemented in FY2011 guide placement decisions for youth by identifying appropriate programs and services needed based on the risk and need scores. The MCASP risk and needs assessment scores have allowed DJS workers to identify youth at high-risk levels or above and to develop service plans to meet the child’s service needs. As a result, youth may be moved from less-restrictive environments to secure programs. Also, Silver Oak Academy, a staff-secure

program, opened in 2010 and has increased its number of youth between 1/31/2010 and 1/31/2011.

Population Flow:

DJS Placement Population Flow - All Placements (count of placements, not children)					
State Fiscal Year	Placements at Start of FY	Starts in FY (New Placements)	Total Served	Ends in FY (Placement Exits)	Placements at End of FY
2009	977	2,123	3,100	2,206	894
2010	894	2,091	2,985	2,104	881
2011	881	1,986	2,867	1,894	973
Two Year Change	-9.8%	-6.5%	-7.5%	-14.1%	8.8%
Average Yearly Change	-4.9%	-3.2%	-3.8%	-7.1%	4.4%
Recent Year Change	-1.5%	-5.0%	-4.0%	-10.0%	10.4%

Table 29: DJS Placement Population Flow

The above population flow table shows the data counts of placements and youth entering or exiting DJS out-of-home care. Within the same FY, it is possible for a youth to have more than one placement admission or release or both due to transfer or a new charge resulting in a new placement. However, youth are counted in only one placement at any point in time. The number of youth at the start of each FY is the balance carried over from the end date of the previous FY, “Start in FY” are new placements or admissions in the FY, and total youth served is a sum of youth at start of FY and new placements in the FY. Exits in FY are the released placements and the placement at end of FY is the last day count of each FY. This table reveals that the beginning of the FY average for three years has decreased by 5%, while the end of the FY average has increased by 4.4%. Each FY, new placements have dropped an average of 3% while the average number of exits dropped 7.1% each year, at more than double the rate of admissions. Although DJS has decreased its population served, it is taking slightly longer for youth to exit the system resulting in end of the FY being slightly higher than the previous years. For example, in both FY2009 and 2010 DJS had a slightly higher number of exits than in FY2011. This may be due to fewer transfers as well as a result of applying the MCASP tool to find a proper placement of youth and keeping them longer in one placement.

The table below explains the same population flow as the above table, breaks down the numbers by each category, and takes into consideration any transfers or new placements within and between each category. The number of youth at the start of each FY is the balance carried over from the end date of the previous FY, new placements are during the FY admissions (multiple unduplicated counts) and exits are during the FY (multiple unduplicated releases) and end of FY (youth count) by each placement category. Over the past three years, DJS has reduced its community-based population from 31% at the start of the FY2009 to 25% at the end of FY2011. At the same time, non-community-based placements have increased from 62% of total youth served in FY2009 to 66% in FY2011, which corresponds to a decrease in total youth served in community-based placements from 29% in FY2009 to 24% in FY2011.

DJS Placement Population Flow - By Category							
	FY	Community-Based	Family Home Settings	Hospitalization	Non-Community-Based	Not Available	All Categories
Placements at beginning of FY (Count of placements, not children)							
Numbers	2009	305	82	12	578	0	977
	2010	273	80	9	532	0	894
	2011	219	82	10	570	0	881
Percentage of Total Placements	2009	31.2%	8.4%	1.2%	59.2%	0.0%	100.0%
	2010	30.5%	8.9%	1.0%	59.5%	0.0%	100.0%
	2011	24.9%	9.3%	1.1%	64.7%	0.0%	100.0%
Entries during FY (Count of placements, not children)							
Numbers	2009	597	128	61	1,337	0	2,123
	2010	510	130	61	1,390	0	2,091
	2011	473	126	74	1,313	0	1,986
Percentage of Total Placements	2009	28.1%	6.0%	2.9%	63.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	2010	24.4%	6.2%	2.9%	66.5%	0.0%	100.0%
	2011	23.8%	6.3%	3.7%	66.1%	0.0%	100.0%
Served during FY (Count of placements, not children)							
Numbers	2009	902	210	73	1,915	0	3,100
	2010	783	210	70	1,922	0	2,985
	2011	692	208	84	1,883	0	2,867
Percentage of Total Placements	2009	29.1%	6.8%	2.4%	61.8%	0.0%	100.0%
	2010	26.2%	7.0%	2.3%	64.4%	0.0%	100.0%
	2011	24.1%	7.3%	2.9%	65.7%	0.0%	100.0%
Exits during FY (Count of placements, not children)							
Numbers	2009	629	130	64	1,383	0	2,206
	2010	565	127	60	1,352	0	2,104
	2011	437	135	74	1,248	0	1,894
Percentage of Total Placements	2009	28.5%	5.9%	2.9%	62.7%	0.0%	100.0%
	2010	26.9%	6.0%	2.9%	64.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	2011	23.1%	7.1%	3.9%	65.9%	0.0%	100.0%
Placements at end of FY (Count of placements, not children)							
Numbers	2009	273	80	9	532	0	894
	2010	218	83	10	570	0	881
	2011	255	73	10	635	0	973
Percentage of Total Placements	2009	30.5%	8.9%	1.0%	59.5%	0.0%	100.0%
	2010	24.7%	9.4%	1.1%	64.7%	0.0%	100.0%
	2011	26.2%	7.5%	1.0%	65.3%	0.0%	100.0%

Table 30: DJS Placement Population Flow by Category

DJS Rate of Entry by Jurisdiction						
Jurisdiction	2009	2010	2011*	Two-Year Change	Average Change	One-Year Change
Allegany	1.5	1.6	2.5	63%	32%	62%
Anne Arundel	1.2	1.3	1.1	-3%	-2%	-13%
Baltimore	2.5	2.7	2.5	1%	1%	-7%
Baltimore City	1.2	1.0	1.0	-18%	-9%	-7%
Calvert	1.7	0.8	1.3	-26%	-13%	53%
Caroline	2.1	1.7	1.6	-21%	-10%	-6%
Carroll	1.5	1.1	1.2	-19%	-10%	17%
Cecil	0.8	0.6	1.4	69%	35%	121%
Charles	2.0	2.1	1.3	-33%	-17%	-39%
Dorchester	2.9	1.8	1.5	-48%	-24%	-14%
Frederick	1.2	0.9	0.7	-42%	-21%	-24%
Garrett	1.7	2.0	1.6	-6%	-3%	-20%
Harford	0.9	0.5	0.4	-56%	-28%	-19%
Howard	0.3	0.4	0.3	-19%	-9%	-21%
Kent	4.2	1.8	2.0	-51%	-26%	13%
Montgomery	0.8	0.8	0.8	-3%	-1%	3%
Prince George's	1.1	1.4	1.2	4%	2%	-14%
Queen Anne's	2.2	1.1	1.0	-56%	-28%	-14%
Somerset	1.7	1.4	1.4	-17%	-9%	0%
St. Mary's	1.5	1.3	1.6	2%	1%	23%
Talbot	1.9	1.4	1.2	-34%	-17%	-9%
Washington	1.8	2.4	1.8	2%	1%	-25%
Wicomico	3.0	3.0	3.9	30%	15%	29%
Worcester	3.5	3.3	2.3	-34%	-17%	-29%
Total	1.4	1.4	1.3	-6%	-3%	-5%


Table 31: DJS Placement Rate of Entry

* The values for 2011 were produced by applying estimates of change in the population between April 1 and July 1 of 2010 to the 2010 Census counts. Further details on this methodology are available at:

http://www.census.gov/popest/methodology/intercensal_nat_meth.pdf.


This table shows the rate of youth in out-of-home placement per 1,000 children ages birth to 18 by county of residence. It is important to note that in smaller counties, even a slight increase of one or two youth served will inflate the percent change. Unless longitudinal trend data are obtained, slight increases and decreases in these jurisdictions between FY may not be worth discussion. The Statewide ratio remained the same at 1.4 youth served per the 1,000 population in FY2009 and FY2010 with a slight drop in FY2011 to 1.3 per 1,000 juvenile population.

Demographics:




DJS All Categories Age Trends				Percent Change	
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
0 through 5	0	0	0	NA	NA
6 through 11	0	1	1	NA	0.0%
12 through 17	687	705	686	2.6%	-2.7%
18 and over	198	225	260	13.6%	15.6%
Total	885	931	947	5.2%	1.7%

Chart 23/Table 32: DJS One-Day Count All Categories Age Trends



DJS All Categories Gender Trends				Percent Change	
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Male	766	794	825	3.7%	3.9%
Female	119	137	122	15.1%	-10.9%
Unknown	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	885	931	947	5.2%	1.7%

Chart 24/Table 33: DJS One-Day Count All Categories Gender Trends



DJS All Categories Race Trends				Percent Change	
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
American Indian / Alaskan	2	2	0	0.0%	-100.0%
Asian	3	2	3	-33.3%	50.0%
Black or African American	612	670	688	9.5%	2.7%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	240	214	210	-10.8%	-1.9%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	0	0	0	NA	NA
Other	25	36	40	44.0%	11.1%
Unknown	3	7	6	133.3%	-14.3%
Total	885	931	947	5.2%	1.7%

Chart 25/Table 34: DJS One-Day Count All Categories Gender Trends

Based on the one-day count for each FY, the male to female ratio remains about the same, with 86% male being the median ratio of boys to girls. However, the proportion of male to female by each placement subcategory is not the same.


Black/African-American placements increased from 69% as of 1/31/09 to 72% on 1/31/11 while the White race group decreased from 27% to 22% for those same dates. The “Other” race group, consisting of Hispanics/Latinos, also increased from slightly less than 3% to slightly over 4%. The “Unknown” category includes youth whose race is not known or not entered in the DJS data system.

Placement by Jurisdiction:

DJS: All Placement Categories and Subcategories																												
Placement Jurisdiction																												
Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	19	2.0%	12	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	65	6.9%	8	5	8	10	0	0	3	0	0	3	1	8	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	9	0
Baltimore	76	8.0%	9	3	15	5	0	0	10	0	1	8	4	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	8	0
Baltimore City	263	27.8%	15	9	34	22	0	0	18	0	0	13	20	30	2	0	0	18	4	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	64	0
Calvert	9	1.0%	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	7	0.7%	0	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	19	2.0%	7	1	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0
Cecil	13	1.4%	0	0	6	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	31	3.3%	3	1	3	4	0	0	3	0	0	4	1	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	3	0
Dorchester	6	0.6%	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	22	2.3%	1	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	1	0
Garrett	7	0.7%	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	12	1.3%	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Howard	7	0.7%	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Kent	6	0.6%	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	92	9.7%	21	4	8	6	0	0	4	0	0	4	8	7	0	0	0	16	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	11	0	
Prince George's	151	15.9%	12	12	14	7	0	0	6	0	1	9	16	16	0	0	0	20	7	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	17	0
Queen Anne's	10	1.1%	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	4	0.4%	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
St. Mary's	19	2.0%	6	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Talbot	6	0.6%	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	36	3.8%	12	0	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	1	0	
Wicomico	35	3.7%	2	1	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	1	0	1	0
Worcester	11	1.2%	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
OOS	21	2.2%	3	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	4	0	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	947	100.0%	119	45	128	85	1	0	48	0	3	50	76	87	2	1	9	79	14	0	0	4	11	58	3	0	124	0
% of placements from jurisdiction			63.2%	7.7%	19.7%	8.4%	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%	0.0%	0.3%	16.7%	18.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	17.4%	4.6%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	22.2%	2.9%	0.0%	19.0%	0.0%	
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			12.6%	4.8%	13.5%	9.0%	0.1%	0.0%	5.1%	0.0%	0.3%	5.3%	8.0%	9.2%	0.2%	0.1%	1.0%	8.3%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	1.2%	6.1%	0.3%	0.0%	13.1%	0.0%

Table 35: DJS All Placement Category and Subcategory

Table 35 (page 48) shows where children from each jurisdiction are placed. This compares the home jurisdiction of each child with the placement jurisdiction. One of the goals of DJS is to keep youth in-State as well as closer to home. However, the risk scores and treatment needs of each youth varies. The availability of services to meet the child’s needs and the availability of an immediate placement is of primary importance. About 90% of DJS youth are placed into in-State programs. The remaining 10% are placed in out-of-State placements that provide specialized services for high-risk youth. These programs are specifically developed to meet the needs of fire setters (arson cases), sex offenders, and serious substance abusers. DJS is continuously making efforts to place youth within or close to their jurisdiction or region; however placement within the region is not practical for Baltimore City youth who account for 28% of the total out-of-home placements. This is due to lack of available secure or hardware-secure committed programs in Baltimore City and Central Maryland. Male youth must be transported to either Youth Centers or the Victor Cullen Center, both located in Western Maryland, and the high-risk female youth are placed at the Waxter Children’s Center in Anne Arundel County. DJS is considering opening a residential treatment facility in Central Maryland. Each of these factors accounts for why certain youth are placed away from their home or out-of-State.




DJS Out of State All Categories Placement Trends				Percent Change	
Category	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Community-Based Residential Placement	1	1	0	0.0%	-100.0%
Family Home Settings	0	0	0	NA	NA
Hospitalization	0	0	0	NA	NA
Non-Community-Based Residential Placement	112	95	124	-15.2%	30.5%
Placement Category Not Available	0	0	0	NA	NA
All Categories	113	96	124	-15.0%	29.2%

Chart 26/Table 36: DJS One-Day Count Out-of-State All Categories Placement Trends

Out-of-State placements decreased by 15% from 1/31/09 to 1/31/20 and increased by 29% from 1/31/10 to 1/31/11. Of the total number of youth served during each FY, out-of State youth constitute approximately 13% of the total population compared to 10% in FY2010 and FY2009.


Placement Costs:



DJS Cost Trends				Percent Change	
Cost Type	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Total Cost	\$74,637,117	\$73,264,788	\$76,201,531	-1.8%	4.0%
Residential Cost	\$59,447,722	\$58,313,237	\$59,293,997	-1.9%	1.7%
Educational Cost	\$10,233,905	\$11,421,749	\$12,999,769	11.6%	13.8%
Administrative Cost	\$4,955,490	\$3,529,804	\$3,907,765	-28.8%	10.7%
% Residential	79.6%	79.6%	77.8%		
% Educational	13.7%	15.6%	17.1%		
% Administrative	6.6%	4.8%	5.1%		


Chart 27/Table 37: DJS Cost Trends

The educational costs have increased dramatically for placements, but are lower in State-run facilities since MSDE began providing education services in a number of facilities. The administrative costs are strictly State-run facilities that include maintenance services and will increase or decrease with large maintenance projects.



DJS All Categories Total Cost Trends				Percent Change	
Category	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Community-Based Residential Placement	\$26,855,023	\$28,877,788	\$29,526,807	7.5%	2.2%
Family Home Settings	\$5,168,242	\$4,935,155	\$4,597,544	-4.5%	-6.8%
Hospitalization	\$196,350	\$266,698	\$270,091	35.8%	1.3%
Non-Community-Based Residential Placement	\$42,417,502	\$39,185,147	\$41,807,089	-7.6%	6.7%
All Categories	\$74,637,117	\$73,264,788	\$76,201,531	-1.8%	4.0%

Chart 28/Table 38: DJS Cost Trends by Category



DJS All Categories Cost Per Bed-Day Trends				Percent Change	
Category	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Community-Based Residential Placement	\$218	\$218	\$219	0.0%	0.5%
Family Home Settings	\$190	\$175	\$175	-7.9%	0.0%
Hospitalization	\$721	\$730	\$739	1.2%	1.2%
Non-Community-Based Residential Placement	\$354	\$374	\$349	5.6%	-6.7%
All Categories	\$276	\$276	\$271	0.0%	-1.8%

Chart 29/Table 39: DJS Cost Per Bed-Day Trends by Category

Department Initiatives

Evidence-Based Programs (EBPs): The Maryland Model for Juvenile Services that was initiated in FY2008 under the leadership of former DJS Secretary Donald W. DeVore is a regionalized model that includes utilization of EBPs and the MCASP. This model continues under the current leadership of Secretary Sam Abed. EBPs include Functional Family Therapy (FFT), Multi-Systemic Therapy (MST), and Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care (MTFC). Both MST and FFT implementation have contributed to the reduction of community-based out-of-home placements. MST is used primarily as therapeutic group home diversion program for juveniles ages 12 through 17. The typical profile of juveniles referred to MST is the same as the FFT programs. DJS funds MST programs in Baltimore City and Baltimore, Carroll, Harford, Howard, and Prince George's Counties.

The Maryland Comprehensive Assessment and Service Planning (MCASP): The MCASP is an assessment tool applied to determine the appropriate placement of children and necessary services. The MCASP uses integrated case management to assess a child's risks and needs throughout the course of his involvement with DJS and to develop interventions that accomplish the dual goals of public safety and child rehabilitation. MCASP enables DJS staff to strengthen individualized service plans for the child and his family, place the child with appropriate services and programs, track the child's progress, and ensure that each child receives the level of supervision consistent with his or her risk to public safety.

Treating Maryland's Children in Maryland: One of the goals of the Maryland Model is to treat Maryland's children in Maryland. The majority of DJS youth are treated in-State. As of January 31, 2011, in-State children accounted for 87% of the total committed population. DJS projects that the creation of two new treatment facilities will reduce the number of children in out-of-State programs.

CORPS in Baltimore City: The CORPS initiative program in Baltimore City began in FY2011 with a grant from the Department of Labor. CORPS is an after-care re-entry program for young men to address their family, educational, and employment needs. Through this grant, 150 youth were served between June and December of 2011. DJS will be tracking their recidivism rates of youth served to measure re-entry into the juvenile/adult systems.

Assessment of Per-Diem Contracts: During FY2011, DJS made a concerted effort to examine all per-diem contracts and selected those that demonstrated good outcomes to provide appropriate placements for youth. As a result, in FY2012, a number of contracts were not continued.

Gaps and Needs

Implementation of MST and FFT programs began in FY2007 and expanded service of these two programs to all jurisdictions could result in further reduction in the group home placements. DJS is validating the MCASP tool on an ongoing basis and the goal is to match every child to a proper placement. Case managers are receiving the necessary training to utilize the MCASP. DJS estimates that it may take a year to reach Statewide utilization of the MCASP.

Since the closure of the Charles Hickey committed programs in 2005, the number of committed children waiting for placement increased. DJS' Comprehensive Capital Plan program (Source:

DJS Comprehensive Plan Update, July 9, 2010) addresses the need for a site selection for a 48-bed secure, State-run, committed treatment program for boys in Baltimore City. The Comprehensive Capital Plan has changed the location from Baltimore City to the Central Region and, subject to the availability of funding, is expected to begin in 2013. The Capital Plan also stated that “in FY2011, the Department also will begin the planning of new staff-secure privately-operated treatment programming for committed girls. The Department expects the creation of the new treatment facilities to reduce the number of youth out-of-state.”

DJS continues to assess the needs of female youth through its female intervention teams and task force. In FY2011, DJS conducted an inventory of all available “Girls Services” and published statistical information on girls in the custody of DJS. The report addressed the number of girls committed to DJS at each decision point in the system as well as their male counterparts for comparison purposes.

Highlights

- Over the past three years youth served in out-of-home placements have declined by 7.5% from 3,100 placements in FY2009 to 2,863 in FY2011.
- In FY2011, 87% of the out-of-home placements are in-State programs. This proportion was slightly higher in FY2010 at 90%, but remained at 87% in FY2009.
- Placements for Black/African-American youth increased from 69% on 1/31/09 to 72% on 1/31/11, while the White race group decreased from 27% to 22% on the same dates. The “Other” race group (consisting of Hispanics/Latinos) also increased from slightly less than 3% to slightly over 4%.
- Placements of female youth have remained relatively constant, at 14% at the start of FY2008 and the end of FY2010.
- The median age of youth at admission has gradually increased, from 16.68 in FY2009, to 16.7 in FY2010, and to 16.74 in FY2011. This may explain the slight increase in the 18 and above population in FY2010 compared to FY2009. The median age of youth at release was 17.1 in FY2009 and FY2010 and 17.3 in FY2011.
- The average length of stay for all placement categories increased from 163 days to 176 days from FY2009 to FY2011.
- Based on FY2011 out-of-home placements, the majority of youth placed are residents of Baltimore City (28%), followed by Prince George’s (16%), Montgomery (10%), Anne Arundel (9%), and Baltimore (8%) Counties.
- In FY2011, youth served in non-community-based placements constituted approximately 66% of all DJS out-of-home placements, an increase of 4% from FY2008 and 2% from FY2010. On the other hand, Community-based placements decreased from 29% in FY2009 to 24% in FY2011.
- Between FY2010 and FY2011, the education costs of DJS youth have increased by 25.1% (\$8,054,189 to \$10,076,431). The residential cost decreased by 3% (\$40,244,900 in FY2010 to \$39,043,016 in FY2011). The combined residential and education cost increase was 1.7%. One new program which was started in FY2009 caused a major increase (<10%) in the education costs between FY2010 and FY2011.

Recommendations

1. Continue to place Maryland youth in-State.

2. Continue to apply the MCASP tool and analyze the discrepancies to modify the tool when and if necessary.
3. Continue initiatives such as the CORPS Program in Baltimore City and expand it to other jurisdictions, as funding is available.
4. Continue to reduce the cost of youth placed out-of-State by having comparable in-State programs.
5. Continue to address the disparities in minority populations, especially African-Americans and Hispanics.

Section III: Family Home Settings

Overview

In this section an analysis of the number of placements for family home settings is discussed. This includes a Statewide summary and analysis by each of the placing/funding agencies represented in this category. Family home settings include the following placements: Relative (Kinship) Care, Foster Care, Treatment Foster Care, Adoptive Care, Individual Family Care, and Living Arrangement – Family Home. A definition of each placement is listed below.

Definitions

Adoptive Care: Out-of-home placement services provided to a child when the permanency plan is adoption but an adoptive family is not yet available or the child is not ready for permanent placement.

Foster Care: Continuous 24-hour care and supportive services provided for a minor child placed by an LDSS. Foster care includes: services to the child’s parent(s) or legal guardian, sibling(s), and relative(s) in order to achieve a safe, permanent placement for the child; supervision of the child in the foster care placement to assure that the placement promotes the child’s physical, emotional, and intellectual growth and well-being; and post-placement services to the child and the child’s caregiver to prevent placement disruption or reentry into out-of-home placement. Foster care placements are made only for children who are abused, neglected, abandoned, or dependent on the State.

Individual Family Care (Individual Family): Individual family care (IFC) is a private, single-family residence that provides a home for up to three individuals with developmental disabilities, who are unrelated to the care provider.

Living Arrangement- Family Home: This placement includes children who are returned to their biological caregivers after an out-of-home placement, non-residential living situation for children old enough to live without adult supervision, and “community-based behavioral respite,” which is relief services provided by a community residential licensee designed to meet the individual behavioral needs of a child with a serious emotional disability for not more than 30 days in a community-based setting.

Formal-Kinship-Care: Provides efforts to place children in short-term substitute care with relatives rather than unrelated foster parents when out-of-home placement is required because of abuse, neglect, or abandonment. Formal Kinship Care placements are not paid.

Restricted Relative Care: Similar to Regular Foster Care, however these providers provide care for specific children only.

Treatment Foster Care (TFC): Designed to provide short-term substitute care for children removed from their homes with services to achieve permanency through family reunification or alternative permanent placement when reunification is not possible. TFC placements are made only for children who are abused, neglected, abandoned, or in State custody. These children also need special treatment. Maryland has four levels for treatment.

Family Home Settings: Number of Placements on January 31, 2011

Table 40 (page 57) provides an overview of the number of placements reported in the single-day count by jurisdiction and location of placement. The first column provides the number of out-of-home placements from the home jurisdiction on the single-day count. The second column provides the percentage that number represents with regard to the total number of Statewide placements on that date. The columns that follow provide the name of the jurisdiction where the placement occurred. The rows at the bottom of the table provide the percentage of placements from the jurisdiction that are also placed in that jurisdiction. The final row provides the percentage of placements in that jurisdiction, out of the total number of Statewide placements reported on that date.

Family Home Settings: Number of Placements on January 31, 2011 by Home and Placement Jurisdiction


Family Home Settings: All Subcategories																												
Placement Jurisdiction																												
Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	102	1.7%	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	11	1
Anne Arundel	97	1.7%	0	58	10	4	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	8	1
Baltimore	392	6.7%	1	8	265	51	0	0	6	3	1	1	1	0	28	7	0	1	4	0	0	0	2	0	1	6	6	
Baltimore City	3271	56.0%	4	84	815	1927	2	1	14	4	8	5	2	0	79	50	0	11	98	0	1	4	1	6	1	0	71	83
Calvert	69	1.2%	0	3	1	1	46	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	2	
Caroline	31	0.5%	0	0	1	0	0	12	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	2	0	5	0	0	
Carroll	26	0.4%	0	0	2	0	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Cecil	96	1.6%	0	2	4	2	0	1	0	75	0	2	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	
Charles	89	1.5%	1	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	
Dorchester	16	0.3%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	
Frederick	118	2.0%	1	1	5	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	75	0	1	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	20	0	0	2	4	
Garrett	32	0.5%	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	
Harford	186	3.2%	0	0	17	13	1	0	1	11	0	0	0	0	123	5	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	1	0	4	5	
Howard	37	0.6%	0	3	7	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	13	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Kent	5	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Montgomery	387	6.6%	0	4	19	8	2	0	6	0	5	0	16	6	3	5	0	247	44	0	0	0	8	0	0	9	5	
Prince George's	429	7.3%	2	9	14	7	8	0	1	0	18	0	0	0	0	7	0	17	327	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	12	
Queen Anne's	17	0.3%	0	1	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	
Somerset	39	0.7%	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	13	1	2	0	
St. Mary's	115	2.0%	0	0	2	3	3	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	12	0	0	60	0	0	0	4	5	
Talbot	33	0.6%	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	20	0	4	0	0	
Washington	157	2.7%	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	138	0	0	3	2	
Wicomico	56	1.0%	0	0	3	1	0	2	0	0	0	9	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	1	2	0	4	0	26	2	1	
Worcester	34	0.6%	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	13	7	2	1	
OOS	6	0.1%	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Grand Total	5840	100.0%	100	174	1176	2029	67	26	56	93	117	44	101	39	245	91	8	285	518	18	24	72	32	180	71	11	141	122
% of placements from jurisdiction			84.3%	59.8%	67.6%	58.9%	66.7%	38.7%	92.3%	78.1%	66.3%	68.8%	63.6%	81.3%	66.1%	35.1%	100.0%	63.8%	76.2%	47.1%	46.2%	52.2%	60.6%	87.9%	46.4%	20.6%	0.0%	0.0%
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			1.7%	3.0%	20.1%	34.7%	1.1%	0.4%	1.0%	1.6%	2.0%	0.8%	1.7%	0.7%	4.2%	1.6%	0.1%	4.9%	8.9%	0.3%	0.4%	1.2%	0.5%	3.1%	1.2%	0.2%	2.4%	2.1%

Table 40: Family Home Settings January 31, 2011

Family Home Settings: Statewide Summary

There were 5,840 placements in family home settings on the one-day count. This includes children in Kinship care and other relative placements (formal and informal); Regular Foster Care, Treatment Foster Care, as well as Pre-adoptive (Adoptive) homes.

Children were placed into family home settings by DHR, and DJS. Chart 30/Table 41 below provides a visual representation of the number of placements in family home settings by placing agency.




Placements By Agency, 1/31/2011	
Agency	Placements
ADAA	0
DDA	0
DHR	5,765
DJS	75
MHA	0
MSDE	0

Chart 30/Table 41: Family Home Settings by Agency

Family Home Settings Placement by Type Across Agencies

36% of the children in family home settings were placed in Treatment Foster Care (see Chart 31/Table 42, below). Families who provide TFC are either licensed under the auspices of a private child placement agency or the LDSS. TFC provides a higher level of supervision and clinical services as compared to regular Foster Care. Foster Care and Formal Kinship Care each made up 23% of the family home placements.



All Agencies Family Home Settings Placement Trends				Percent Change	
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Adoptive Care	100	98	60	-2.0%	-38.8%
Foster Care	1,552	1,473	1,365	-5.1%	-7.3%
Formal Relative (Kinship) Care	1,558	1,460	1,316	-6.3%	-9.9%
Restricted Relative (Kinship) Care	1,027	854	634	-16.8%	-25.8%
Treatment Foster Care	2,112	2,152	2,100	1.9%	-2.4%
Living Arrangement - Family Home	406	453	365	11.6%	-19.4%
Total	6,755	6,490	5,840	-3.9%	-10.0%


Chart 31/Table 42: All Agencies Family Home Settings One-Day Count Placement Trends

From January 31, 2009 to January 31, 2011, there has been a steady decline in the number of placements in family home settings, from 6,755 to 5,840 children/youth. It should be noted that each subcategory has experienced a reduction in the number of placements.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES (DHR)

DHR is committed to ensuring that children and youth in out-of-home care are placed in family home settings whenever safe and possible. This is one of the central principles of the Place Matters initiative, which began in July 2007. Since that time, the percentage of children/youth in family home settings has increased to over 75% of the current DHR out-of-home population.

Population Totals:



DHR Placements by Subcategory, 1/31/2011	
Subcategory	Placements
Adoptive Care	60
Foster Care	1,358
Formal Relative (Kinship) Care	1,316
Restricted Relative (Kinship) Care	634
Treatment Foster Care	2,032
Living Arrangement - Family Home	365

Chart 32/Table 43: DHR Family Home Setting Placements by Subcategory, 1/31/2011

Family homes (for DHR) are defined as placements in a family setting, and include:

- Adoptive care (pre-finalized adoptive homes);
- Foster care (emergency, intermediate, regular foster care, and respite care);
- Relative/kinship care (paid/restricted/relative and unpaid/formal kinship care);
- Treatment foster care (private and public); and
- Living arrangements (primarily Trial Home Visits with family of origin, but also including own home/apartment).

Relative/kinship care is divided into two categories – paid and unpaid – although the type of placement and experience for the child is not significantly different and both represent placement within the child’s own family, which is always preferable when safe and possible. In both types of placements, children are in the care/custody of the LDSSs. Together, these placement categories represent 34% of all DHR family home placements, and 25% of all DHR out-of-home placements.


Foster care and treatment foster care represent 24% and 35% of all children/youth in DHR family homes, respectively. Together these placements account for 45% of all children in DHR out-of-home care. These placements represent the least-restrictive placements available to children outside of their own family or adoptive family.

Approximately 10% of all children/youth in DHR out-of-home care have a plan of adoption as their permanency plan, and approximately 5% are legally free for adoption, meaning their parents' parental rights have been terminated.¹⁰ Not all children/youth who are legally free for adoption have a plan of adoption and not all children with a plan of adoptions are legally free for adoption. Older youth may be working towards Another Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA). Approximately 1% of all children in family homes, and slightly less than 1% of all children/youth in DHR out-of-home care, is in pre-adoptive placements.

DHR utilizes "Living Arrangement" as a data-entry category that contains several different types of placements. In the family home category, there are two main types of placements: trial home-visits and own home/apartment. The trial home-visit category includes placements with the child's parents/family of origin, and represents what others may consider "aftercare" – the time period in which the child is living with his/her parents/family of origin, after a period of out-of-home placement, but the child remains under the care/custody of the LDSS. This type of placement is used when the parents/caregivers have demonstrated reduced risk and increased safety, and are preparing for reunification. Older youth may also live in their own home/apartments, either while working or attending college or other job training programs. Together, these categories represent 6% of all family home placements.

Please note that Individual Family Care is not a category used by DHR.

¹⁰ DHR/SSA calculations, based on 12-month averages; DHR State Stat file – *03-State Stat Jurisdiction Data – August 2011*.



DHR Family Home Settings Placement Trends				Percent Change	
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Adoptive Care	100	98	60	-2.0%	-38.8%
Foster Care	1,547	1,466	1,358	-5.2%	-7.4%
Formal Relative (Kinship) Care	1,558	1,460	1,316	-6.3%	-9.9%
Restricted Relative (Kinship) Care	1,027	854	634	-16.8%	-25.8%
Treatment Foster Care	2,034	2,066	2,032	1.6%	-1.6%
Living Arrangement - Family Home	406	453	365	11.6%	-19.4%
Total	6,672	6,397	5,765	-4.1%	-9.9%

Chart 33/Table 44: DHR Family Home Settings Placement Trends

DHR Family Home Settings Placement Trends			
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011
Family Home placements	6672	6397	5765
All DHR OOH placements	8928	8515	7615
Percent of Family Home out of all DHR OOH	74.7%	75.1%	75.7%

Table 45: DHR Comparison of All OOH with Family Home Settings Placement Trends

DHR Family Home Settings Placement Trends – percent of total DHR family home placements			
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011
Adoptive Care	1%	2%	1%
Foster Care	23%	23%	24%
Relative (Kinship) Care – Unpaid*	23%	23%	23%
Relative (Kinship) Care – Paid*	15%	13%	11%
Treatment Foster Care	30%	32%	35%
Living Arrangement - Family Home	6%	7%	6%
Total	6672	6397	5765

Table 46: Percent of total DHR family home placements

*Relative Kinship Care (paid and unpaid, total) = 38%, 36%, 34%


Although the number of children in DHR family home settings has decreased each year, this is due to the overall decrease of children in the total DHR out-of-home population. Additionally, the percentage of children in family home placements has remained steady (74.7% - 75.7%). This is a result of DHR’s Place Matters initiative and Family Centered Practice model.

The number of children in adoptive care has decreased as a result of two main factors: one, the commitment of DHR and the LDSSs to work towards reunification and guardianship when possible (in lieu of termination of parental rights and adoption) and two, increased adoptions in fiscal years 2009 and 2010. These two factors – a decline of children in need of adoptive homes, and past efforts to finalize adoptions that may have been previously delayed – have led to a currently lower number than in the past two years of children in pre-adoptive homes.

Although both Foster Care and TFC placements remained fairly consistent in their percentages out of all DHR out-of-home placements (23-24% and 30-35%, respectively), the number of Foster Care placements declined over 12% from 2009 to 2011 while the number of TFC placements was nearly the same from 2009 to 2011. This indicates a significant trend in DHR out-of-home placements: while the number of children in out-of-home care has decreased, the type of child in out-of-home care had changed – children who now are in placement (either entering or remaining) are those with more intensive needs than in previous years. Therefore, even within the family home category, there is a shift towards the more intense placement type of TFC. As further evidence of this shift, the percentage of children in Relative Kinship Care, paid and unpaid together, declined from 38% in 2009 to 34% in 2011.

The proportion of children in trial home visits and their own home/apartments has remained consistent at 6-7%, although there has been variation from year to year in the actual numbers.

Population Demographics:



DHR Family Home Settings Age Trends				Percent Change	
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
0 through 5	2,091	1,892	1,622	-9.5%	-14.3%
6 through 11	1,599	1,386	1,166	-13.3%	-15.9%
12 through 17	2,069	2,140	1,960	3.4%	-8.4%
18 and over	913	979	1,017	7.2%	3.9%
Total	6,672	6,397	5,765	-4.1%	-9.9%

Chart 35/Table 47: DHR Family Home Settings Age Trends

DHR Family Home Settings, 1/31/2011			
Age	Family Home	All DHR OOH	Percent in Family Home
0 through 5	1622	1647	98%
6 through 11	1166	1245	94%
12 through 17	1960	2784	70%
18 and over	1017	1939	52%
Total	5765	7615	76%

Table 48: DHR Age Comparison of All OOHP with Family Home Settings, 1/31/2011

DHR Family Home Settings Age Trends – percent of children by age, out of all DHR family home placements			
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011
0 through 5	31%	30%	28%
6 through 11	24%	22%	20%
12 through 17	31%	33%	34%
18 and over	14%	15%	18%
Total	100%	100%	100%


Table 49: Percent of children by age, out of all DHR family home placements

Consistent with DHR policy, including Place Matters and Family Centered Practice principles, 98% of all children ages five and under are placed in family home settings, as are 94% of children ages six to eleven. Children ages five and under constitute 28% of all family home placements and children ages six to eleven represent 20% of all family home placements (2011).

70% of all youth ages 12 through 17 are in family home settings, although only 52% of all youth over 18 are in these placements. This may be attributable to normal life events such as youth age and developmental stages, including college and job training programs, which take youth away from family placements. This is true for DHR youth as well as youth not involved with any State agency. Additionally, youth who are in DHR out-of-home care are likely to have experienced some type of abuse or neglect, which can lead to emotional and behavioral issues and often worsen during adolescence. Those with more intense issues require higher levels of placements than family homes.

Over the past three years, the proportion of youth ages 12-17 and 18 and over have both risen, with 34% of all youth in family home settings being youth ages 12-17, and 18% ages 18 and over (2011).

DHR Family Home Settings by Gender, 1/31/2011




DHR Family Home Settings Gender Trends				Percent Change	
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Male	3,377	3,194	2,853	-5.4%	-10.7%
Female	3,295	3,203	2,911	-2.8%	-9.1%
Unknown*	0	0	1	NA	NA
Total	6,672	6,397	5,765	-4.1%	-9.9%

Chart 36/Table 50: DHR Family Home Settings Gender Trends

*Unknown = gender not identified in the child's MD CHESSIE record.

The breakdown of children/youth in DHR family homes by gender remains even. As shown above, there has been a similar decrease in the overall numbers of males and females. The difference between males and females is less than 1% of all children in DHR family home settings, and there is a slight trend towards more females than males.



DHR Family Home Settings Race Trends				Percent Change	
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
American Indian / Alaskan	5	5	1	0.0%	-80.0%
Asian	13	12	14	-7.7%	16.7%
Black or African American	4,845	4,588	3,931	-5.3%	-14.3%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	1	2	2	100.0%	0.0%
White	1,403	1,356	1,384	-3.3%	2.1%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	234	250	227	6.8%	-9.2%
Other	93	113	120	21.5%	6.2%
Unknown*	78	71	86	-9.0%	21.1%
Total	6,672	6,397	5,765	-4.1%	-9.9%

Chart 37/Table 51: DHR Family Home Settings Race Trends


*Unknown = race not identified in the child's MD CHESSIE record.

DHR Family Home Settings Race Trends, proportion of all children/youth in DHR family home placements			
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011
Black or African American	73%	72%	68%
White	21%	21%	24%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	4%	4%	4%
Other	1%	2%	2%
Unknown*	1%	1%	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Table 52: Proportion of all children/youth in DHR family home placements

The number of Black/African-American children/youth in family home settings has decreased slightly and more than the overall decrease of all children in family home settings, resulting in a smaller percentage in 2011 (68%) than in 2009 (73%). Meanwhile, the number of White children/youth has increased slightly, resulting in a corresponding increase in the percentage of all children in family home settings from 21% in 2009 compared to 24% in 2011.

Out-of-State Demographics:




DHR Out-of-State Family Home Settings Placement Trends				Percent Change	
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Adoptive Care	14	10	9	-28.6%	-10.0%
Foster Care	102	83	53	-18.6%	-36.1%
Formal Relative (Kinship) Care	41	22	26	-46.3%	18.2%
Restricted Relative (Kinship) Care	70	63	44	-10.0%	-30.2%
Treatment Foster Care	6	9	9	50.0%	0.0%
Living Arrangement - Family Home	4	0	0	-100.0%	NA
Total	237	187	141	-21.1%	-24.6%

Chart 38/Table 53: DHR Out of State Family Home Settings Placement Trends

Each year, less than 4% of all family home placements are in out-of-State, and that percentage has decreased to 2% as of January 31, 2011.

The numbers of children in out-of-State family home placements are dependent upon individual children’s needs and family situations. Adoptive Care, Formal Kinship Care, trial home-visits, and own home/apartment consistently constitute over 51% of all out-of-State placements in this category. These placements (Adoptive Care, Formal Kinship Care, trial home-visit, and own home/apartment) are completely child- and family-driven, as opposed to being driven by resource home availability. This means a child’s relatives or parents may be located in another state, the best fit for an adoptive home may be out-of-State, and/or an older youth may choose to attend college out-of-State. Regardless of these locations, it is nearly always in the child’s best interest to be placed with biological family, with a permanent adoptive family, or to allow the youth to explore his or her educational and career potential.

DHR Out of State by Family Home Settings Age Group, 1/31/2011




DHR Out-of-State Family Home Settings Age Trends				Percent Change	
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
0 through 5	89	68	44	-23.6%	-35.3%
6 through 11	67	42	29	-37.3%	-31.0%
12 through 17	66	64	56	-3.0%	-12.5%
18 and over	15	13	12	-13.3%	-7.7%
Total	237	187	141	-21.1%	-24.6%

Chart 39/Table 54: DHR Out-of-State Family Home Settings Age Trends

Age breakdowns for children in out-of-State family home settings is similar to that of all DHR family settings, although there is a higher proportion of youth ages 12 through 17 out-of-State than in the total of all family home settings.


DHR Out of State by Family Home Settings Gender, 1/31/2011



DHR Out-of-State Family Home Settings Gender Trends				Percent Change	
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Male	110	95	70	-13.6%	-26.3%
Female	127	92	71	-27.6%	-22.8%
Unknown	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	237	187	141	-21.1%	-24.6%

Chart 40/Table 55: DHR Out-of-State Family Home Settings Gender Trends

As with all DHR family home settings, there is a fairly even split between males and females in out-of-State family home settings. More variation in these percentages is seen in the out-of-State subset due to the smaller total number.



DHR Out-of-State Family Home Settings Race Trends				Percent Change	
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
American Indian / Alaskan	0	0	0	NA	NA
Asian	1	1	1	0.0%	0.0%
Black or African American	150	119	92	-20.7%	-22.7%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	75	58	40	-22.7%	-31.0%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	5	7	8	40.0%	14.3%
Other	3	0	0	-100.0%	NA
Unknown	3	2	0	-33.3%	-100.0%
Total	237	187	141	-21.1%	-24.6%

Chart 41/Table 56: DHR Out-of-State Family Home Settings Race Trends

The proportion of Black/African-American children/youth in out-of-State family home settings is slightly lower than the proportion of this subpopulation in all DHR family home placements, while the proportion of White children/youth is correspondingly slightly higher.

Placement Costs:




Chart 42/Table 57: DHR Family Home Settings Total Cost Trends

DHR placements costs cannot be broken down by placement subcategory. Composite foster home costs include all subcategories except those entered as living arrangement. Typically, living arrangements are a data-entry classification for placements that do not require DHR payment – such as trial home visit or the youth’s own home/apartment.




Chart 43/Table 58: DHR Family Home Settings Cost Per Bed-Day Trends

The increase in total placement costs from FY2009 to FY2010 appears to be due to higher bed-day costs while the subsequent decrease from FY2010 to FY2011 appears to be due to a combination of a lower number of children in placement and lower bed-day costs.

Resource Development

Needs - Maryland continues to need resource parents for teens, sibling groups and medically fragile children. Though gains have been made in these areas, especially through educating current resource parents, they remain the most needed. Recruitment of minority resource parents, in particular Spanish-speaking parents, continues. In many cases, the potential resource parents who respond to outreach efforts are only interested in younger children or children solely available for adoption.

Conclusion & Recommendations

DHR has made significant reductions in the number of children in DHR out-of-home care since the initiation of the Place Matters Initiative in July 2007, and current Family Centered Practices and other strategies continue to support these efforts.


Approximately 76% of all children in DHR out-of-home care are placed in family homes, reflecting the success of the Place Matters Initiative in keeping children in family homes. The total numbers of children in family home placements, however, has decreased along with the total out-of-home population.

The largest age group in DHR family home placements is 12-17 years old (34%), and African-American children/youth constitute approximately 68% of all children in this category. The proportions of males and females are nearly equal. Approximately 98% of all children under age six and 94% of all children ages six to eleven in DHR out-of-home care are in family home placements.

Placement needs are highest for children with special needs, and older youth. DHR will continue to look for alternatives to congregate (group home) placements where appropriate for specific children, and will increase efforts to place children in public foster care homes in lieu of TFC homes when possible. Statewide efforts to provide wraparound and supportive services to children with intensive needs should be continued.

DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE SERVICES (DJS)

Population Totals:




DJS Placements by Subcategory, 1/31/2011	
Subcategory	Placements
Adoptive Care	0
Foster Care	7
Formal Relative (Kinship) Care	0
Restricted Relative (Kinship) Care	0
Treatment Foster Care	68
Living Arrangement - Family Home	0

Chart 44/Table 59: DJS Placements by Subcategory, 1/31/2011

Family home settings include Foster Care and Treatment Foster Care youth. Foster Care serves low risk children who cannot be managed in their own homes with continuous care and support services provided by DJS-approved family homes.

TFC provides 24-hour home care and intensive support services in family settings for a youth with serious emotional, medical and psychological conditions. Foster Parents usually receive extensive pre-service training and in-service supervision and support; they have been trained to work with youth who have special needs. TFC homes are generally clustered within a program under the oversight and management of a mental health professional or specialist trained in dealing with these youth. Frequent contact between foster parents, professionals, and specialists is expected. (Source: Gap Analysis Report published March 9, 2009).

Of the 947 total children placed in out-of-home residential programs, 75 youth or 8% are placed in family home settings.




DJS Family Home Settings Placement Trends				Percent Change	
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Adoptive Care	0	0	0	NA	NA
Foster Care	5	7	7	40.0%	0.0%
Formal Relative (Kinship) Care	0	0	0	NA	NA
Restricted Relative (Kinship) Care	0	0	0	NA	NA
Treatment Foster Care	78	86	68	10.3%	-20.9%
Living Arrangement - Family Home	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	83	93	75	12.0%	-19.4%

Chart 45/Table 60: DJS Family Home Settings Placement Trends


The increase or decrease in population on the one-day count does not provide a true picture of the overall FY trend. DJS intake referrals have sharply decreased in the past three years, causing a decrease in the committed population from FY2009 to FY2011. TFC numbers decreased on January 31, 2011 compared to January 31, 2010. This decrease may be attributable to the efforts of Mentor Maryland – community-based services which served 33 youth as of January 31, 2010 as opposed to only 16 youth as of January 31, 2011.

Population Demographics:



DJS Family Home Settings Age Trends				Percent Change	
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
0 through 5	0	0	0	NA	NA
6 through 11	0	0	0	NA	NA
12 through 17	47	60	42	27.7%	-30.0%
18 and over	36	33	33	-8.3%	0.0%
Total	83	93	75	12.0%	-19.4%


Chart 46/Table 61: DJS Family Home Settings Age Trends



DJS Family Home Settings Gender Trends				Percent Change	
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Male	66	68	57	3.0%	-16.2%
Female	17	25	18	47.1%	-28.0%
Unknown	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	83	93	75	12.0%	-19.4%

Chart 47/Table 62: DJS Family Home Settings Gender Trends

DJS Family Home Settings by Race, 1/31/2011



DJS Family Home Settings Race Trends				Percent Change	
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
American Indian / Alaskan	0	1	0	NA	-100.0%
Asian	0	0	0	NA	NA
Black or African American	54	62	47	14.8%	-24.2%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	24	25	23	4.2%	-8.0%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	0	0	0	NA	NA
Other	4	4	5	0.0%	25.0%
Unknown	1	1	0	0.0%	-100.0%
Total	83	93	75	12.0%	-19.4%

Chart 48/Table 63: DJS Family Home Settings Race Trends

The majority of youth are between 16 and 18 years old. Between the two age groups presented above, the group of youth ages 18 and above has decreased by 3 youth or 8% between 1/31/09 and 1/31/10 and remained the same between 1/31/10 and 1/31/11. The proportion of this group with the total family setting population has also been about the same with 44% accounting for youth 18 years old and above and the remaining 56% falling in the 12-17 age group.

Gender-based percentages for males decreased from 80% in FY2009 to 76 % in FY2011. Conversely, female percentages increased from 20% in FY2009 to 24 % in FY2011.

The African American population decreased from 65% in FY2009 to 62% in FY2011 and the White percentage increased from 29% to 31%. The “Other” race includes Hispanic population and between FY2009 and FY2011 their percentage increased from 5% to 7%. The “Unknown” category is used when the youth’s race is not known or the data has not been entered into the system.

Out-of-State Demographics:

All DJS Foster Care and Treatment Foster Care are In-State Only.

Placement Costs:




Chart 49/Table 64: DJS Family Home Settings Total Cost Trends

Foster Care is the least expensive type of placement. Accordingly, it is preferable for a greater percentage of DJS placements to be family home settings, but one of the limitations is the number of foster care families. When foster parents retire new parents are hard to find. The Western Region (Frederick to Garrett Counties) is the only DJS region in the State to have Foster Care placements. TFC costs vary due to increases or decreases in population totals.




Chart 50/Table 65: DJS Family Home Settings Total Cost Per Bed-Day Trends

The cost per bed-day chart (Chart 50/Table 65, page 76) shows the ADP costs for Foster Care and TFC placements.

Resource Development

Gaps and Needs:

With diversion programs in place, DJS continues to place a small number of children in Foster Care or TFC. DJS provides an array of non-residential services including Day and Evening Center Programs, Pre-Adjudication Coordination, and Transition centers (PACT) located in Baltimore City and Prince George's County, and MST and FFT programs for those children who are able to stay at home.

Highlights:

- Over the past three years, approximately 8% of placements were committed placements to family home settings.
- The ratio of male to female placements decreased 4% from the 2009 one-day census.
- Black/African-American youth ranked the highest, accounting for 62% of the total placements.
- The average age at the time of placement decreased from 16.9 in FY2009 to 16.7 in FY2011.

Recommendations

- Expand PACT programs and Day and Evening Centers to join other DJS regions.
- Continue current MST and FFT programs and expand in other DJS regions.

Section IV: Community-Based Residential Programs

Overview

An analysis of the number of placements for community-based residential programs is discussed in this section and includes a summary and analysis by each of the placing/funding Agencies represented in this category. Community-Based Residential Programs include the following placements: Independent Living, Community-Supported Living Arrangement (CSLA), and Residential Child Care Programs (RCCPs). Each of these placements is defined below.

Definitions

Independent Living Programs: Independent living programs must operate under the auspices of a child-placement agency licensed by the DHR Office of Licensing and Monitoring in accordance with Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 07.05.01 and 07.05.04. These programs are designed for older children mature enough to function autonomously for the most part. Children live in apartments and attend college, high school, trade schools, or engage in other training preparation programs with minimal Agency supervision. The program is designed to teach self-sufficiency and independent living skills because of the unlikelihood of returning home. Children may reside in a foster care home or group home, including a **supervised apartment unit**, and must be enrolled in high school, college, vocational training, or be employed.

Living Arrangements - Community-Based: Includes placements in an institution of higher learning; children in this category typically live on-campus, a halfway house, temporary shelter placement for homeless children, or a residential program for job training.

Residential Child Care Programs (RCCP): Provides 24-hour per day care for children with a structured set of services and activities that are designed to achieve specific objectives relative to the needs of the children served. These programs include the provision of food, clothing, shelter, education, social services, health, mental health, recreation, or any combination of these services and activities. An RCCP includes those that are licensed by DHMH; DHR; or DJS; and are subject to the regulations governing the operation of RCCPs.

Alternative Living Unit (ALU): A program that provides services in a structured, staff-supervised home licensed by DHMH/DDA for individuals who, because of developmental disability, require specialized care. The service setting is one to three developmentally developmentally-delayed children with systemic problems.

Community-Supported Living Arrangement (CSLA): A residence:

- (a) Which is rented or owned by an individual or the individual's family or proponent or held in trust for an individual;
- (b) Where an individual lives as a roommate without the individual's name appearing on the lease or title; or
- (c) For which the licensee is the guarantor of rental or mortgage payments for an individual receiving CSLA services.

Services are provided to assist an individual in non-vocational activities necessary to enable that individual to live in the individual's own home, apartment, family home, or rental unit, with (i) No more than two other nonrelated recipients of these services; or (ii) Members of the same family regardless of their number.

CSLA include:

- (i) Personal assistance services;
- (ii) Supports that enhance the individual's opportunity for community participation and to exercise choice and control over the individual's own life;
- (iii) Training and other services necessary to assist the individual in achieving and maintaining increased integration, interdependence, and productivity;
- (iv) 24-hour emergency assistance;
- (v) Assistive technology;
- (vi) Adaptive equipment;
- (vii) Resource coordination;
- (viii) Environmental modifications;
- (ix) Respite services; and
- (x) Other services as approved by the Secretary or the Secretary's designee.

DDA Group Home: A residence owned, leased, or operated by a DDA licensee that: (a) Provides residential services for individuals who, because of a developmental disability, require specialized living arrangements; (b) Admits at least four individuals but not more than eight; and (c) Provides 10 or more hours of supervision per unit, per week.

Group Home: Services provided to children who need more supervision than a relative, foster parent or treatment foster parent can provide. A program that provides varying levels of care based on the abilities, disabilities and functioning of children referred and placed.

High Intensity Group Home: A group home that provides services to children presenting emotional and/or behavioral conditions requiring a higher level of structured supervision, behavior management and clinical intervention.

Medically Fragile Program (MFP): A program designed to serve a child who is dependent upon any combination of the following: mechanical ventilation for at least part of each day; intravenous administration of nutritional substances or drug; other device-based respiratory or nutritional support on a daily basis, including tracheotomy tube care, suctioning, or oxygen support; other medical devices that compensate for vital body functions; including Apnea or cardio-respiratory monitors; renal dialysis; or other mechanical devices; or substantial nursing care in connection with disabilities.

Respite Program: Temporary care provided in a substitute care setting. The purpose may be to give relief to the caregiver, to regulate or change a child's medication or treatment plan or to provide care while a child is awaiting permanent placement.

Shelter Program: Temporary care in an out-of-home placement due to serious allegations of parental abuse or neglect. Stays generally last from 30 to 90 days or until a court can determine whether a more permanent placement is appropriate.

Therapeutic Group Home: Services provided in a home (for 4 to 8 children) licensed by the DHMH Administration Office of Health Care Quality for children that need structure and supervision due to medically-diagnosed disorders such as emotional disturbance, schizophrenia, or bi-polar disorder. It includes a formal program of basic care, social work, mental health and health care services, which can include the daily administration of medicine.

Teen Mother Program: A licensed residential program that provides care and services for children who are mothers with an infant.

Community-Based Residential Programs: Number of Placements on January 31, 2011

Table 80 (page 81) provides an overview of the number of placements reported in the single-day count by jurisdiction and location of placement. The first column provides the number of out-of-home placements from the home jurisdiction on the single-day count. The second column provides the percentage that number represents with regard to the total number of Statewide placements on that date. The final row provides the percentage of placements in that jurisdiction, out of the total number of Statewide placements reported on that date.


Community-Based Residential Programs: Number of Placements on January 31, 2011 by Home and Placement Jurisdiction

Community Based Residential Placements: All Subcategories																													
Placement Jurisdiction																													
Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown	
Allegany	14	0.9%	7	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	
Anne Arundel	56	3.7%	0	18	16	2	0	1	0	1	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	2	0	
Baltimore	145	9.6%	3	4	78	17	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	1	6	5	0	6	10	0	2	0	0	4	1	0	4	0	
Baltimore City	612	40.4%	4	14	163	297	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	0	21	52	0	8	0	0	16	1	0	12	12	
Calvert	10	0.7%	0	0	3	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Caroline	5	0.3%	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Carroll	23	1.5%	1	0	3	2	0	0	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	
Cecil	19	1.3%	0	0	8	2	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Charles	26	1.7%	0	1	4	1	2	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	
Dorchester	6	0.4%	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Frederick	40	2.6%	0	1	2	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	4	0	
Garrett	11	0.7%	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	
Harford	58	3.8%	0	1	26	3	0	3	0	4	2	0	0	2	7	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	3	0	
Howard	27	1.8%	0	0	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	
Kent	4	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Montgomery	154	10.2%	0	3	16	5	0	0	0	2	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	99	8	0	2	0	0	6	1	0	4	4	
Prince George's	186	12.3%	1	11	21	8	1	1	0	2	2	0	7	0	2	0	0	21	89	0	1	0	0	13	0	0	4	2	
Queen Anne's	8	0.5%	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	
Somerset	9	0.6%	1	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
St. Mary's	19	1.3%	0	0	5	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	
Talbot	1	0.1%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Washington	46	3.0%	3	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	31	1	0	0	1	
Wicomico	23	1.5%	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	0	2	0	
Worcester	7	0.5%	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	
OOS	5	0.3%	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	1514	100.0%	21	55	376	356	7	9	11	18	17	0	14	9	23	21	10	171	183	1	15	3	0	112	15	1	45	21	
% of placements from jurisdiction			50.0%	32.1%	53.8%	48.5%	20.0%	0.0%	34.8%	21.1%	15.4%	0.0%	5.0%	27.3%	12.1%	29.6%	75.0%	64.3%	47.8%	12.5%	22.2%	5.3%	0.0%	67.4%	43.5%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			1.4%	3.6%	24.8%	23.5%	0.5%	0.6%	0.7%	1.2%	1.1%	0.0%	0.9%	0.6%	1.5%	1.4%	0.7%	11.3%	12.1%	0.1%	1.0%	0.2%	0.0%	7.4%	1.0%	0.1%	3.0%	1.4%	

Table 80: Community-Based Residential Placement on January 31, 2011

Community-Based Residential Programs Statewide Summary


There were 1,514 community-based residential placements as reported in the one-day count. Children were placed or funded in community-based residential placements by DDA, DHR, and DJS. The graph below provides a visual representation of the number of community-based residential placements by placing or funding Agency.



Placements By Agency, 1/31/2011	
Agency	Placements
ADAA	0
DDA	107
DHR	1,170
DJS	237
MHA	0
MSDE	0

Chart 51/Table 81: Number of Community-Based Residential Placements by Placing or Funding Agency

Community-Based Residential Placement by Type Across Agencies



All Agencies Placements by Subcategory, 1/31/2011	
Subcategory	Placements
Independent Living Programs	234
Residential Child Care Program	1,105
Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA)	96
Living Arrangement - Community-Based	79

Chart 52/Table 82: All Agencies Community-Based Placements by Subcategory, 1/31/2011

As in family home settings, the majority of community-based residential placements, 77%, were made by DHR. DJS represented 16% and DDA 7% of the community-based residential placements.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES (DHR)

DHR community-based placements include independent living programs, group homes (residential child care programs), and other placements such as college and Job Corps. DHR is committed to serving each child/youth in a family home setting whenever safe and possible. Accordingly, the number of children/youth in community-based placements is significantly lower than those in family home placements. There are times, however, when community-based placements are the least restrictive and most appropriate placement.

Population Totals:





Chart 53/Table 83: DHR Community-Based Placements by Subcategory, 1/31/2011

DHR community-based placements include independent living programs, group homes, and additional placements that are not unique to children in care, such as college and Job Corps. Group homes often serve specialized populations, and these placements include:

- Alternative Living Units
- Emergency Group Shelter Care
- Residential Group Home
- Teen Mother Programs
- Therapeutic Group Homes




DHR Community-Based Placement Trends				Percent Change	
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Independent Living Programs	195	229	205	17.4%	-10.5%
Residential Child Care Program	1,396	1,016	886	-27.2%	-12.8%
Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA)	0	0	0	NA	NA
Living Arrangement - Community-Based	58	76	79	31.0%	3.9%
Total	1,649	1,321	1,170	-19.9%	-11.4%

Chart 54/Table 84: DHR Community-Based Placement Trends by Subcategory

Community-based placements have decreased since 2009, as the out-of-home population in general has decreased and more children are served in family home settings. Independent living programs serve a small number of children/youth, less than 20% of all children/youth in community-based programs. Although group homes (“RCCP”) constitute the majority of DHR’s community-based population, these placements have decreased by 36% since 2009. “Living arrangement” is a data-entry category of placements, generally not requiring funding by DHR, including college, Job Corps, and other placements.


Population Demographics:



DHR Community-Based Age Trends				Percent Change	
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
0 through 5	15	4	1	-73.3%	-75.0%
6 through 11	116	71	34	-38.8%	-52.1%
12 through 17	914	610	510	-33.3%	-16.4%
18 and over	604	636	625	5.3%	-1.7%
Total	1,649	1,321	1,170	-19.9%	-11.4%

Chart 55/Table 85: DHR Community-Based Placement Age Trends


As would be expected, very few children under the age of 12 are in a community-based placement. The majority are youth ages 18 and over, as DHR encourages youth turning 18 to remain in care if they have yet not exited to a permanent placement. The only increase seen since 2009, in fact, was in 2010 in the age group of 18 and over, and is likely a result of this policy.



DHR Community-Based Gender Trends					
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Male	969	779	702	-19.6%	-9.9%
Female	680	542	468	-20.3%	-13.7%
Total	1649	1321	1170	-19.9%	-11.4%

Chart 56/Table 86: DHR Community-Based Placement Gender Trends

Unlike the DHR placement population as a whole, there is a discrepancy between male and female representation in community-based placements, with approximately 59% - 60% of children/youth being male. Since 2009, there has been a slightly larger decrease in community-based placements among females than males.




DHR Community-Based Race Trends				Percent Change	
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
American Indian / Alaskan	2	1	1	-50.0%	0.0%
Asian	9	8	10	-11.1%	25.0%
Black or African American	1,190	915	841	-23.1%	-8.1%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	2	2	1	0.0%	-50.0%
White	369	318	267	-13.8%	-16.0%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	42	33	26	-21.4%	-21.2%
Other	20	17	11	-15.0%	-35.3%
Unknown*	15	27	13	80.0%	-51.9%
Total	1,649	1,321	1,170	-19.9%	-11.4%

Chart 57/Table 87: DHR Community-Based Placement Race Trends

*Unknown = race not identified in the child's MD CHESSIE record.

The racial breakdown of DHR's community-based population is similar to that of the DHR population as a whole – approximately 69% - 72% are African-American, and approximately 23% are White. There have been decreases in the number of children from both racial groups.


Out-of-State Demographics:



DHR Out-of-State Community-Based Placement Trends				Percent Change	
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Independent Living Programs	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Child Care Program	65	47	44	-27.7%	-6.4%
Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA)	0	0	0	NA	NA
Living Arrangement - Community-Based	2	1	1	-50.0%	0.0%
Total	67	48	45	-28.4%	-6.3%

Chart 58/Table 88: DHR Out-of-State Community-Based Placement Trends


As with all DHR populations, the numbers of children in out-of-State community-based programs have decreased since 2009. Nearly all children in this category are in group homes, and the policies and practices to ensure that children are in family home settings and close to their homes (when safe and possible) have positively influenced these decreases.



DHR Out-of-State Community-Based Age Trends				Percent Change	
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
0 through 5	0	0	0	NA	NA
6 through 11	0	0	1	NA	NA
12 through 17	32	18	23	-43.8%	27.8%
18 and over	35	30	21	-14.3%	-30.0%
Total	67	48	45	-28.4%	-6.3%


Chart 59/Table 89: DHR Out-of-State Community-Based Placement Age Trends

As with all community-based placements, the majority of youth are 12 or over, with a fairly even distribution between the youth ages 12-17 and 18-21.



DHR Out-of-State Community-Based Gender Trends				Percent Change	
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Male	44	28	29	-36.4%	3.6%
Female	23	20	16	-13.0%	-20.0%
Total	67	48	45	-28.4%	-6.3%

Chart 59/Table 89: DHR Out-of-State Community-Based Placement Gender Trends




DHR Out-of-State Community-Based Race Trends				Percent Change	
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
American Indian / Alaskan	0	0	0	NA	NA
Asian	1	1	1	0.0%	0.0%
Black or African American	26	24	26	-7.7%	8.3%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	34	21	17	-38.2%	-19.0%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	4	0	1	-100.0%	NA
Other	2	0	0	-100.0%	NA
Unknown*	0	2	0	NA	-100.0%
Total	67	48	45	-28.4%	-6.3%

Chart 60/Table 90: DHR Out-of-State Community-Based Placement Gender Trends

*Unknown = race not identified in the child's MD CHESSIE record.

Due to the small numbers of children in out-of-State community-based placements, it is difficult to discern meaningful trends over only a three-year period. There are wider fluctuations among the proportions of each racial group than seen in the total out-of-home population.


Placement Costs:



DHR Community-Based Total Cost Trends				Percent Change	
Subcategory	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Total	\$156,230,898	\$115,833,311	\$93,862,100	-25.9%	-19.0%

Chart 62/Table 92: DHR Community-Based Placement Total Cost Trends

**Breakdowns by placement type are not available.*



DHR Community-Based Cost Per Bed-Day Trends				Percent Change	
Subcategory	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Total	\$281	\$250	\$229	-11.0%	-8.4%

Chart 63/Table 93: DHR Community-Based Placement Total Cost Per Bed-Day Trends

**Breakdowns by placement type are not available.*

The combination of reductions in both bed-day costs and number of children in community-based placements has led to substantial reductions in placement costs. There has been a 40% reduction in costs for community-based placements since FY2009 and this has been a significant factor in the overall reduction in DHR placement costs.


Conclusion & Recommendations

Note: DHR's Place Matters indicators focus on group home placements only (not all community-based placements), so data from DHR Place Matters reports cannot be directly compared to the data presented below.

There has been an overall reduction in the number of children in community-based placements, due to the overall reduction of the DHR out-of-home population and the increased priority on placing children/youth in family home settings when safe and appropriate. Children/youth in community-based settings constitute approximately 15% of DHR's out-of-home population. Race breakdowns are similar to that of the general DHR out-of-home population, although the age breakdown is skewed toward older youth and the gender breakdown is skewed toward males.

DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE SERVICES (DJS)

Population Totals:




DJS Placements by Subcategory, 1/31/2011	
Subcategory	Placements
Independent Living Programs	20
Residential Child Care Program	217
Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA)	0
Living Arrangement - Community-Based	0

Chart 64/Table 94: DJS Placements by Subcategory, 1/31/2011

The above community-based placement population table includes independent living and residential child care programs. The latter includes DJS youth placed in Alternative Living Units (ALU), Residential Child Care Programs, also known as Groups Homes (GH), and Therapeutic Group Homes (TGH).

Independent Living Unit (ILU) Programs prepare youth to live on their own and generally some youth from GH and TGH are placed prior to home release. GH and TGHs are residential facilities located in the community that provide out-of-home services for four or more moderate to high-risk youth. These youth generally need more structure and supervision than a Relative Home, Foster Home, or TFC could offer. ALUs are for youth with developmental disabilities. (Source: Gap Analysis Report published March 9, 2009).

Of the 947 total youth in out-of-home residential programs, 237 or 25% are in community-based placements.




DJS Community-Based Placement Trends				Percent Change	
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Independent Living Programs	16	20	20	25.0%	0.0%
Residential Child Care Program	222	248	217	11.7%	-12.5%
Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA)	0	0	0	NA	NA
Living Arrangement - Community-Based	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	238	268	237	12.6%	-11.6%

Chart 65/Table 95: DJS Community-Based Placement Trends


The increase or decrease in population for the one-day count may not show the actual percentage increases or decreases of the total number of youth served during the FY as they tend to change on a daily, weekly, and monthly basis. However, this trend can indicate whether the data show significant changes in numbers during the same dates between the FY. The above table shows a decrease in community-based programs from FY2010 to FY2011 by 12%. DJS intake referrals have sharply decreased in the past three years, causing the decrease in the committed population from FY2009 to FY2011. Additionally, the decrease in population during FY2011 could be a result of DJS' efforts to reduce the overall community-based population through increased implementation of the evidence based early intervention programs such as FFT and MST to divert low-risk youth in the community from more intensive DJS services.

Population Demographics:




DJS Community-Based Age Trends				Percent Change	
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
0 through 5	0	0	0	NA	NA
6 through 11	0	0	0	NA	NA
12 through 17	192	211	174	9.9%	-17.5%
18 and over	46	57	63	23.9%	10.5%
Total	238	268	237	12.6%	-11.6%

Chart 66/Table 96: DJS Community-Based Age Trends



DJS Community-Based Gender Trends				Percent Change	
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Male	191	213	189	11.5%	-11.3%
Female	47	55	48	17.0%	-12.7%
Unknown	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	238	268	237	12.6%	-11.6%

Chart 67/Table 97: DJS Community-Based Gender Trends



DJS Community-Based Race Trends				Percent Change	
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
American Indian / Alaskan	1	0	0	-100.0%	NA
Asian	1	1	0	0.0%	-100.0%
Black or African American	169	205	182	21.3%	-11.2%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	60	54	42	-10.0%	-22.2%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	0	0	0	NA	NA
Other	7	7	11	0.0%	57.1%
Unknown	0	1	2	NA	100.0%
Total	238	268	237	12.6%	-11.6%


Chart 68/Table 98: DJS Community-Based Race Trends

The two age groups reported are 12-17 and 18 and above. It is evident that the 18 and above age group noticeably increased by 25% from 1/31/09 to 1/31/10 and 11% from 1/31/10 to 1/31/11. Placement of youth ages 12-17 increased about 10% from 1/31/09 to 1/31/10 and substantially decreased 18% from 1/31/10 to 1/31/11.

The proportion of male to female percentages remains the same, with male at 80%, and female at 20% for all FY one day counts.

As of 1/31/2011, African American youth accounted for 77% of the total count and White youth accounted for 18%. Between the one-day counts from one FY to another, African American youth increased by 21% from 1/31/09 to 1/31/10, but decreased by 11% from 1/31/10 to 1/31/11. The population of White youth decreased by 10% from 1/31/09 to 1/31/10 and again decreased by 22% from 1/31/10 to 1/31/11. The “Other” race category, which includes the Hispanic youth population, increased by 57% from 1/31/10 to 1/31/11. It should be noted that this increase represents a change from 7 to 11 youth.

Out-of-State Demographics:




DJS Out-of-State Community-Based Placement Trends				Percent Change	
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Independent Living Programs	0	1	0	NA	-100.0%
Residential Child Care Program	1	0	0	-100.0%	NA
Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA)	0	0	0	NA	NA
Living Arrangement - Community-Based	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	1	1	0	0.0%	-100.0%

Chart 69/Table 99: DJS Out-of-State Community-Based Placement Trends

DJS places only a small number of youth in community-based out-of-State placements. On January 31, 2010, one youth was admitted to Adelphoi Village Specialized Independent Living Program and another youth was admitted to Mid-Atlantic Youth Services – Intensive Open Residential Treatment (Group Home) Program. These two youth needed the specialized treatment services available at these out-of-home placements.


Placement Costs:



DJS Community-Based Total Cost Trends				Percent Change	
Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Independent Living Programs	\$2,735,959	\$2,950,676	\$4,318,540	7.8%	46.4%
Residential Child Care Program	\$23,498,721	\$24,560,987	\$23,549,308	4.5%	-4.1%
Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA)	\$620,343	\$1,366,125	\$1,658,959	120.2%	21.4%
Total	\$26,855,023	\$28,877,788	\$29,526,807	7.5%	2.2%

Chart 70/Table 100: DJS Community-Based Total Cost Trends

The fluctuation of these placement costs is due to the increases or decreases in population totals.



DJS Community-Based Cost Per Bed-Day Trends				Percent Change	
Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Independent Living Programs	\$204	\$203	\$225	-0.5%	10.8%
Residential Child Care Program	\$219	\$218	\$216	-0.5%	-0.9%
Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA)	\$252	\$258	\$244	2.4%	-5.4%
Total	\$218	\$218	\$219	0.0%	0.5%

Chart 71/Table 101: DJS Community-Based Cost Per Bed-Day Trends

The ADP costs per child bed-day fluctuated slightly, but overall for this category of less than one percent. Keep in mind the FY2011 costs showed many increases in education costs.

Gaps and Needs

DJS' goal is to achieve a 20% reduction in the community-based population by diverting children through participation in MST and FFT programs. With improved non-residential community supervision services such as probation, community detention, electronic monitoring and Global Positioning System (GPS) monitoring, DJS also plans to reduce out-of-home placements. DJS continues to improve case management processes to shorten the waiting time in pending placement to appropriately place children without delays caused by the interagency approval protocols.

Highlights:

- Over the past three years, approximately 25% of placements were in committed community-based programs.
- Male placements have remained constant at 80% with the remaining 20% female in all three FYs.
- Over the past three years, the proportion of Black/African-American youth increased from 71% in FY2009 to 77% in FY2011. The placements of White youth were reduced from 25% to 18%.


- The average age at the time of placement increased from 16.5 in FY2009 to 16.7 in FY2011.

Recommendations

- Continue to reduce the DJS group home population.
- Expand implementation of the MST and FFT slots to various jurisdictions Statewide.
- Increase the community services for children placed on probation, community detention, and GPS monitoring.

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND MENTAL HYGIENE
DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES ADMINISTRATION (DDA)**


Population Totals:



DDA Placements by Subcategory, 1/31/2011	
Subcategory	Placements
Independent Living Programs	9
Residential Child Care Program	2
Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA)	96
Living Arrangement - Community-Based	0

Chart 72/Table 102: DDA Placements by Subcategory, 1/31/2011

DDA provides a coordinated service delivery system so that individuals with developmental and intellectual disabilities receive appropriate services oriented toward the goal of integration into the community. These services are provided through a combination of State residential centers and a wide array of community-based services delivered primarily through a network of non-profit providers. The subcategories of Independent Living and Residential Child Care Program (RCCP) are defined as a residence owned, leased, or operated by a DDA licensee that: (a) Provides residential services for individuals who, because of a developmental disability, require specialized living arrangements; (b) Admits not more than 3 individuals; and (c) Provides 10 or more hours of supervision per unit, per week. Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA) is defined as a residence: (a) Which is rented or owned by an individual or the individual's family or proponent or held in trust for an individual; (b) Where an individual lives as a roommate without the individual's name appearing on the lease or title; or (c) In which the licensee is the guarantor of rental or mortgage payments for an individual receiving CSLA services. As demonstrated in the chart above, the highest number of placements occurs in CSLA. This is a more natural home model which the DDA promotes with its mission.




DDA Community-Based Placement Trends				Percent Change	
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Independent Living Programs	6	12	9	100.0%	-25.0%
Residential Child Care Program	7	0	2	-100.0%	NA
Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA)	135	117	96	-13.3%	-17.9%
Living Arrangement - Community-Based	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	148	129	107	-12.8%	-17.1%

Chart 73/Table 103: DDA Community-Based Placement Trends


As shown in the chart, DDA out-of-home placements have decreased by an average of 12.8% from the end of FY2009 to FY2010. Between FY2010 and FY2011 there was a 17.1% decrease in the number of overall DDA community-based placements. The continued reduction may be at least partially attributable to two distinct factors: DDA continuing its work to provide services to children within the family home, and more recent focus to ensure that children needing out-of-home placement access all entitlement services prior to accessing DDA funds for services. DDA has had fewer children/youth come into placement in the past three years.

Population Demographics:




DDA Community-Based Age Trends				Percent Change	
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
0 through 5	1	1	0	0.0%	-100.0%
6 through 11	13	9	6	-30.8%	-33.3%
12 through 17	69	53	43	-23.2%	-18.9%
18 and over	65	66	58	1.5%	-12.1%
Total	148	129	107	-12.8%	-17.1%

Chart 74/Table 104: DDA Community-Based Age Trends



DDA Community-Based Gender Trends				Percent Change	
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Male	93	82	65	-11.8%	-20.7%
Female	55	47	42	-14.5%	-10.6%
Total	148	129	107	-12.8%	-17.1%

Chart 75/Table 105: DDA Community-Based Gender Trends



DDA Community-Based Race Trends				Percent Change	
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
American Indian / Alaskan	1	0	0	-100.0%	NA
Asian	1	1	1	0.0%	0.0%
Black or African American	32	33	26	3.1%	-21.2%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	46	32	26	-30.4%	-18.8%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	0	0	0	NA	NA
Other	50	45	36	-10.0%	-20.0%
Unknown	18	18	18	0.0%	0.0%
Total	148	129	107	-12.8%	-17.1%

Chart 76/Table 106: DDA Community-Based Race Trends

Chart 74/Table 104 (page 103) shows that on January 31st of the three years the majority of children funded by DDA that reside in out-of-home placements, are age 18 and over. The percentage of children ages 0-12 who receive funding from DDA for out-of-home placement is lower than the other age groups. This may be attributed to the fact that other State systems are the primary funding source for supporting infants and children outside of the home.

Chart 75/Table105 (page 103) demonstrates that the number of male and female children receiving funding for out-of-home placement from DDA remains constant. There continues to be a greater number of males than females.


Chart 76/Table 106 (above) shows that over the three-year period, the three most common races of children receiving services from DDA are “Black/African American,” “White,” and “Other.” In this table there is the category of “Unknown.” This may occur because this demographic is self-reported. While most of the applications received by the DDA are from the family or the individual that will be receiving services, there are some circumstances where the application is submitted by a person that may not have all of the demographic information.

Placement by Jurisdiction:

Home Jurisdiction of Children	# children from jurisdiction in placement % of children statewide in placements from Jurisdiction		Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																									
			Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	2	1.9%	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	6	5.6%	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	20	18.7%	0	0	17	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore City	7	6.5%	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calvert	1	0.9%	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	8	7.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	1	0.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	3	2.8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	1	0.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	1	0.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	4	3.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	1	0.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	33	30.8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prince George's	9	8.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queen Anne's	1	0.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	2	1.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	1	0.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	3	2.8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	3	2.8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	107	100.0%	2	5	20	8	1	0	8	1	3	0	1	0	0	4	1	33	9	1	1	1	0	3	3	0	0	0
% of children from jurisdiction			100.0%	83.3%	85.0%	71.4%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%	11.1%	100.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% children statewide in all			1.9%	4.7%	18.7%	7.5%	0.9%	0.0%	7.5%	0.9%	2.8%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%	0.9%	30.8%	8.4%	0.9%	0.9%	0.0%	2.8%	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Table 107: DDA Placement by Jurisdiction on January 31, 2011

The chart above supports DDA’s policy to place children in services that are close to their families. This chart shows that the majority of children from Montgomery County are placed in Montgomery County. This may occur due to the number of providers that are located in that jurisdiction that is licensed to support children. On the other hand, Prince George’s County has a low number of children from that jurisdiction that are being supported in that jurisdiction. Although it is the goal of DDA to place children in services that are close to their families, there are times when this is not possible due to the lack of providers in their jurisdiction that are licensed to provide supports to children.




DDA Out-of-State Community-Based Placement Trends				Percent Change	
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Independent Living Programs	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Child Care Program	0	0	0	NA	NA
Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA)	1	1	0	0.0%	-100.0%
Living Arrangement - Community-Based	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	1	1	0	0.0%	-100.0%

Chart 77/Table 108: DDA Out-of-State Community-Based Placement Trends

DDA makes every effort to place children in services that are close to their families. To accomplish this, DDA tries to place children in their home jurisdiction and in-State.


Placement Costs:



DDA Community-Based Total Cost Trends				Percent Change	
Subcategory	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Residential Child Care Program	\$818,583	\$1,931,304	\$1,751,912	135.9%	-9.3%
Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA)	\$5,179,937	\$3,307,332	\$2,823,562	-36.2%	-14.6%
Total	\$5,998,520	\$5,238,636	\$4,575,474	-12.7%	-12.7%

Chart 78/Table 109: DDA Community-Based Total Cost Trends

This chart shows a decrease in the cost of placement in the last three years. The cost has decreased because the cost of a CSLA is less than a RCCP and for the past three years DDA has had more placements in CSLA than any other category.



DDA Community-Based Cost Per Bed-Day Trends				Percent Change	
Subcategory	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Residential Child Care Program	\$280	\$322	\$327	15.0%	1.6%
Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA)	\$92	\$72	\$72	-21.7%	0.0%
Total	\$102	\$101	\$103	-1.0%	2.0%

Chart 79/Table 110: DDA Community-Based Cost Per Bed-Day Trends

During FY2009 and FY2010 there was an increase in the price per child in RCCP. This increase may have occurred due to the increased cost to operate the RCCP. During the FY2009 and FY2010 there was a decrease in the cost of CSLA. This decrease may be attributed to the decrease in the number of children supported in CSLA. During FY2010 and FY2011 there was a small increase in the cost per bed-day for all categories. This may be due to the decrease in the number of children being supported in DDA services.

Conclusions:

- Resource Development
 - The greatest challenge to the DDA system continues to be the identification and support of children between the ages of 18-21 who are aging out of other support systems. The identification of these children to allow for transition planning is critical to an effective transition process. Incompatible data systems between Administrations and confidentiality issues create barriers to this process.
 - DDA collaborates with other Agencies responsible for the welfare of children. DDA representatives serve on multiple interagency and intra-agency boards, coordinating councils, committees, and task forces at the State and local levels to coordinate and share resources for children. Additionally, in order to maximize available resources, arrangements for the co-funding of interagency service plans may be made for children who qualify for services through multiple agencies.

- Conclusion & Recommendations
 - Data Summary
 - Since FY2009, DDA has decreased the cost of providing this service to children by 12.7% each year.
 - Since FY2009, DDA has decreased the number of children that are in out-of-home placements.
 - For FY2011, DDA was able to provide out-of-home placements, for the majority of children, in the same jurisdiction that is the home jurisdiction for the child receiving supports.

 - Recommendations
 - Continue to work with other Administrations and community resources to assist children to remain in their homes.
 - Continue to explore the development of resources that will help families support their children with disabilities at home.

Section V: Non-Community-Based Residential Placements

Overview

This section provides an analysis of the number of placements in non-community-based residential programs. This includes a Statewide summary and analysis by each of the placing/funding agencies represented in this category. Non-Community-Based Residential Programs (NCB) includes the following placements: Residential Treatment Centers; Adult Corrections; Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers; Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs; Residential Educational Facilities; Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program; and Non-Secure/Non-RTC.

Definitions

Detention and Commitment Centers: Detention Centers are secure facilities for pre-treatment of children pending placement. Commitment Centers are secure treatment facilities for children with a broad range of emotional, behavioral and other needs.

Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program: Short-term care not to exceed ninety (90) days in length that identifies and facilitates diagnostic services for children in need of stabilization before transition into a longer-term placement setting.

Living Arrangement-Non-Community-Based: Includes juvenile commitment facilities, the adult criminal correctional system and residential juvenile detention and juvenile detention programs.

Non-Secure/Non-RTC: These are placements for children whose profile indicates no need for either a secure facility or the intensive psychiatric care provided by a RTC. These facilities are for children with low- to medium- risk security profiles.

Residential Educational Facilities: An organized non-public education program of instruction in English language arts, mathematics, science, social studies and other curricular areas provided by a teacher to students enrolled in grades K-12.

Residential Treatment Centers (RTC): An RTC refers to a specialized type of facility that offers intensive psychiatric care. RTC facilities must be licensed by the DHMH Office of Health Care Quality and accredited by the Joint Commission. There is a specified set of psychiatrists, psychiatric nurses, and other mental health professionals required to be on staff to meet the RTC licensing requirements as well as a set of quality of care standards for RTC operation.

Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs:

- **ASAM Level III.1 (Halfway House)** - Clinically-Managed Low-Intensity Residential Treatment
- **ASAM Level III.3 (Long-Term Care)** - Clinically-Managed Medium-Intensity Residential Treatment
- **ASAM Level III.5 (Therapeutic Community)** - Clinically-Managed High-Intensity Residential Treatment
- **ASAM Level III.7 (Intermediate Care Facility)** - Medically-Monitored Intensive Inpatient Treatment

- **ASAM Level III.7.D – Medically-Monitored Inpatient Detoxification**

Non-Community-Based Residential Programs: Number of Placements on January 31, 2011

Table 111 (page 111) provides an overview of the number of placements reported in the single-day count by jurisdiction and location of placement. The first column provides the number of out-of-home placements from the home jurisdiction on the single-day count. The second column provides the percentage that number represents with regard to the total number of Statewide placements on that date. The columns that follow provide the name of the jurisdiction where the placement occurred. The rows at the bottom of the table provide the percentage of placements from the jurisdiction that are also placed in that jurisdiction. The final row provides the percentage of placements in that jurisdiction, out of the total number of Statewide placements reported on that date.


Non-Community-Based Residential Programs: Number of Placements on January 31, 2011 by Home and Placement Jurisdiction

Non-Community Based Residential Placements: All Subcategories																												
Placement Jurisdiction																												
Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	23	1.4%	9	0	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	106	6.5%	9	18	22	18	0	2	4	2	0	6	1	8	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0
Baltimore	228	13.9%	10	8	45	94	0	2	15	2	0	13	10	9	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	12	3	
Baltimore City	455	27.7%	15	14	112	107	0	2	27	1	0	16	31	34	1	1	0	2	1	0	0	2	0	7	0	0	69	13
Calvert	14	0.9%	2	2	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	
Caroline	9	0.5%	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Carroll	32	2.0%	11	1	4	4	0	0	5	0	0	1	3	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Cecil	33	2.0%	2	2	14	6	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Charles	42	2.6%	4	1	7	8	1	1	3	0	1	6	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	
Dorchester	28	1.7%	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Frederick	64	3.9%	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	0	0	2	0	12	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	
Garrett	12	0.7%	3	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Harford	38	2.3%	1	0	10	9	0	1	2	0	0	6	4	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	
Howard	18	1.1%	0	1	2	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	5	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	
Kent	9	0.5%	0	0	3	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Montgomery	172	10.5%	24	3	21	11	0	4	5	1	0	7	13	7	2	2	0	51	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	17	0	
Prince George's	162	9.9%	13	9	33	10	0	1	6	1	0	18	11	16	0	0	0	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	2	
Queen Anne's	8	0.5%	3	3	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Somerset	5	0.3%	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
St. Mary's	36	2.2%	8	1	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	
Talbot	13	0.8%	4	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Washington	39	2.4%	9	0	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	
Wicomico	37	2.3%	5	2	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	
Worcester	11	0.7%	2	1	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
OOS	46	2.8%	3	1	21	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Grand Total	1640	100.0%	141	75	346	310	1	16	73	8	1	104	139	91	12	9	4	91	17	0	0	5	0	25	2	0	152	18
% of placements			39.1%	17.0%	19.7%	23.5%	0.0%	0.0%	15.6%	0.0%	2.4%	64.3%	59.4%	8.3%	2.6%	16.7%	0.0%	29.7%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%	0.0%	2.6%	2.7%	0.0%	15.2%	0.0%
% placements			8.6%	4.6%	21.1%	18.9%	0.1%	1.0%	4.5%	0.5%	0.1%	6.3%	8.5%	5.5%	0.7%	0.5%	0.2%	5.5%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	1.5%	0.1%	0.0%	9.3%	1.1%

Table 111: Non-Community-Based Residential Placements on January 31, 2011

Non-Community-Based Residential Programs Statewide Summary

There were 1,640 children in non-community-based residential placements on the single-day count. 38.4% of non-community-based residential placements were made by DJS and MHA placed 26.5% of the children in non-community-based residential placements.




Placements By Agency, 1/31/2011	
Agency	Placements
ADAA	204
DDA	0
DHR	306
DJS	630
MHA	434
MSDE	66

Chart 80/Table 112: Placements By Agency, 1/31/2011

Non-Community-Based Residential Placements by Type Across Agencies

Non-community-based residential placements include diagnostic evaluation treatment programs (DETP); long-term and short-term substance abuse programs (ASAM); detention/commitment facilities (D/C); Residential Treatment Centers (RTCs); Non-Secure/Non-RTC, and residential educational facilities (REFs).




All Agencies Non-Community-Based Placement Trends				Percent Change	
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	9	12	15	33.3%	25.0%
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	174	178	166	2.3%	-6.7%
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	32	23	35	-28.1%	52.2%
Residential Educational Facilities	52	59	44	13.5%	-25.4%
Residential Treatment Centers	988	914	820	-7.5%	-10.3%
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	365	400	438	9.6%	9.5%
Living Arrangement - Non-Community-Based	84	100	122	19.0%	22.0%
Total	1,704	1,686	1,640	-1.1%	-2.7%

Chart 81/Table 113: All Agencies Non-Community-Based Placement Trends

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES (DHR)

Approximately 4% of all DHR placements are non-community-based placements. These placements are designed for children and youth with the most intensive needs (such as severe mental health disorders) or those youth who are incarcerated (either in the adult or juvenile criminal justice system). These placements are not funded by DHR.

Population Totals:




DHR Placements by Subcategory, 1/31/2011	
Subcategory	Placements
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	0
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	0
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	0
Residential Educational Facilities	0
Residential Treatment Centers	184
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	0
Living Arrangement - Non-Community-Based	122

Chart 82/Table 114: DHR Placements by Subcategory, 1/31/2011

DHR children/youth may be placed in three categories of non-community-based placements:

- Residential treatment centers;
- Secure detention facilities – through a juvenile court commitment; and
- Correctional institution – through an adult criminal court order.

Both secure detention facility and correctional institution placements fall into the MD CHESSIE data-entry category of “living arrangement.” Depending on the youth’s age and the criminal charge, the youth may be involved in either the juvenile or adult criminal justice systems, with the placement dependent on that court’s order.




DHR Non-Community-Based Placement Trends				Percent Change	
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	0	0	0	NA	NA
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	0	0	0	NA	NA
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Educational Facilities	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Treatment Centers	251	239	184	-4.8%	-23.0%
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	0	0	0	NA	NA
Living Arrangement - Non-Community-Based	84	100	122	19.0%	22.0%
Total	335	339	306	1.2%	-9.7%

Chart 84/Table 116: DHR Non-Community-Based Placement Trends

As community-based initiatives, including CMEs, have been implemented Statewide, the need for RTC placement decreased. The number of youth placed in criminal justice-related placements, however, has increased.


Population Demographics:



DHR Non-Community-Based Age Trends				Percent Change	
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
0 through 5	0	0	0	NA	NA
6 through 11	30	17	21	-43.3%	23.5%
12 through 17	255	250	193	-2.0%	-22.8%
18 and over	50	72	92	44.0%	27.8%
Total	335	339	306	1.2%	-9.7%

Chart 85/Table 117: DHR Non-Community-Based Age Trends


As would be expected, no child under the age of six is placed in a non-community-based placement. The children ages 6 through 11 are primarily in RTC placements, not juvenile court-related placements. The majority of youth in non-community-based placements are ages 12-17.



DHR Non-Community-Based Gender Trends				Percent Change	
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Male	206	204	204	-1.0%	0.0%
Female	129	135	102	4.7%	-24.4%
Total	335	339	306	1.2%	-9.7%

Chart 86/Table 118: DHR Non-Community-Based Gender Trends

About two-thirds of the youth in non-community-based placements are male. The number of males in these placements has not changed significantly since 2009, although the number of females has decreased 21% from 2009.



DHR Non-Community-Based Race Trends				Percent Change	
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
American Indian / Alaskan	2	0	1	-100.0%	NA
Asian	1	1	0	0.0%	-100.0%
Black or African American	216	217	213	0.5%	-1.8%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	94	107	74	13.8%	-30.8%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	20	13	10	-35.0%	-23.1%
Other	2	0	6	-100.0%	NA
Unknown	0	1	2	NA	100.0%
Total	335	339	306	1.2%	-9.7%

Chart 87/Table 119: DHR Non-Community-Based Race Trends

The racial breakdown of youth in non-community-based placements remains similar to that of the overall DHR population, with approximately 64%-70% African-American, and 24%-32% White. There has been little change in the number of Black/African-American youth and the fluctuations in the number of White youth are likely due to the smaller numbers.

Placement Costs:

DHR does not fund non-community-based placements. RTC placements are funded by Medicaid and criminal justice-related placements are funded by the appropriate system, juvenile or adult.


Conclusions:

Numbers of both males and African-Americans in non-community-based placements have changed little since 2009. This is not to say that there are a high number of Black/African-American males in this placement category or that there have not been a substantial number of exits and new entries. These are, however, topics worthy of additional study. Rather, the importance of the stability of this data confirms that while the overall number of children/youth in DHR out-of-home care has been decreasing, there continues to be a shift towards children and youth with more intensive needs. Without this shift, there would be a more significant reduction in the numbers of children in non-community-based placement than is demonstrated by the current data.

Accordingly, there is a continued need for intensive services and placements Statewide, specifically in the area of delinquency prevention and alternatives to RTC placements.

DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE SERVICES (DJS)

Population Totals:




DJS Placements by Subcategory, 1/31/2011	
Subcategory	Placements
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	15
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	166
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	35
Residential Educational Facilities	0
Residential Treatment Centers	180
Substance Abuse and Addictions Programs (ASAM)	234
Living Arrangement - Non-Community-Based	0

Chart 88/Table 120: DJS Placements by Subcategory, 1/31/2011

Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers include youth served in Redirect and Youth Center Programs. Non-Secure/Non RTC programs are mostly hardware secure and staff-secure programs. Most of the hardware-secure programs are for high-risk youth and these specialized services are primarily available in out-of-State facilities. The majority of staff-secure placements serve youth in State operated Youth Center programs such as Victor Cullen Center, and a few out of state staff secure programs. The only hardware-secure program in-State for females is Waxter Children's Center.

RTCs include both in-State and out-of-State programs and are offered to youth who need criminogenic treatment and psychiatric care. Substance Abuse and Addictions Programs include all in-State and out-of-State programs including Meadow Mountain Youth Center and Schaefer House.

Of the 947 youth in the total DJS out-of-home residential population, 630 or 67% of youth are in the non-community-based subcategory.




DJS Non-Community-Based Placement Trends				Percent Change	
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	9	12	15	33.3%	25.0%
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	174	178	166	2.3%	-6.7%
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	32	23	35	-28.1%	52.2%
Residential Educational Facilities	1	1	0	0.0%	-100.0%
Residential Treatment Centers	156	156	180	0.0%	15.4%
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	184	192	234	4.3%	21.9%
Living Arrangement - Non-Community-Based	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	556	562	630	1.1%	12.1%

Chart 89/Table 121: DJS Non-Community-Based Placement Trends


The increase in population as of January 31, 2011 could be a result of DJS' implementation of the MCASP tool used to inform placement decisions for youth based on their risk score and needed treatment services. In addition, programs like Silver Oak, Woodward Youth Cooperation, and Schaefer House served more youth as of January 31, 2011 as compared to January 31, 2010.

Population Demographics:




DJS Non-Community-Based Age Trends				Percent Change	
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
0 through 5	0	0	0	NA	NA
6 through 11	0	1	1	NA	0.0%
12 through 17	442	428	466	-3.2%	8.9%
18 and over	114	133	163	16.7%	22.6%
Total	556	562	630	1.1%	12.1%

Chart 90/Table 122: DJS Non-Community-Based Age Trends



DJS Non-Community-Based Gender Trends				Percent Change	
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Male	502	506	575	0.8%	13.6%
Female	54	56	55	3.7%	-1.8%
Total	556	562	630	1.1%	12.1%

Chart 91/Table 123: DJS Non-Community-Based Gender Trends



DJS Non-Community-Based Race Trends				Percent Change	
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
American Indian / Alaskan	1	1	0	0.0%	-100.0%
Asian	2	1	3	-50.0%	200.0%
Black or African American	383	398	456	3.9%	14.6%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	154	132	143	-14.3%	8.3%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	0	0	0	NA	NA
Other	14	25	24	78.6%	-4.0%
Unknown	2	5	4	150.0%	-20.0%
Total	556	562	630	1.1%	12.1%


Chart 92/Table 124: DJS Non-Community-Based Race Trends

Age is calculated as of January 31, 2011. The average age of youth served is 16.8. Between January 31, 2009 and January 31, 2011, youth in the age group 18 and above increased by 17% and increased another 23% from January 31, 2010 to January 31, 2011.

The youth gender ratio is approximately 91% male and 9% female for all one-day counts. The female population increased by 1 youth from FY2009 to FY2010 and decreased by 1 youth from FY2010 to FY2011.

The percentage of African American youth has increased from 69% on 1/31/09 to 72% on 1/31/11. The percentage of White youth decreased from 28% in to 23% on those same dates. Other race includes the Hispanic population served and that percentage increased from 3% to 4% between these two dates. This proportion is based on the total youth count during the one-day census. The African American population increased by 4% and 15% from 1/31/2009 to 1/31/2010 and 1/31/2010 to 1/31/2011, respectively. The “Unknown” category means the youth’s race is not known or the data is not entered in the system.

Out-of-State Demographics:




DJS Out-of-State Non-Community-Based Placement Trends				Percent Change	
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	1	2	5	100.0%	150.0%
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	0	0	0	NA	NA
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	28	19	28	-32.1%	47.4%
Residential Educational Facilities	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Treatment Centers	32	21	23	-34.4%	9.5%
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	51	53	68	3.9%	28.3%
Living Arrangement - Non-Community-Based	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	112	95	124	-15.2%	30.5%

Chart 93/Table 125: DJS Out-of-State Non-Community-Based Placement Trends

The proportion of out-of-State non-community-based placements to in-State non-community-based placements varied between 1/31/09 and 1/31/11. The lowest was on 1/31/10 with 20% and the highest was 25% in both FY2009 and FY2011. Considering that most of the hardware-secure facilities are non-community-based programs, DJS makes an effort to place youth within the State. Maryland does not have enough secure facilities to serve high-risk youth requiring hardware, staff-secure, and specialized RTC placements (dually diagnosed youth). Those youth must be placed out-of-State to receive appropriate placement and treatment.


DJS Out of State by Non-Community Based Age Group, 1/31/2011



DJS Out-of-State Non-Community-Based Age Trends				Percent Change	
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
0 through 5	0	0	0	NA	NA
6 through 11	0	0	0	NA	NA
12 through 17	78	59	79	-24.4%	33.9%
18 and over	34	36	45	5.9%	25.0%
Total	112	95	124	-15.2%	30.5%


Chart 94/Table 126: DJS Out-of-State Non-Community-Based Age Trends

DJS Out of State by Non-Community Based Gender, 1/31/2011



DJS Out-of-State Non-Community-Based Gender Trends				Percent Change	
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Male	107	89	123	-16.8%	38.2%
Female	5	6	1	20.0%	-83.3%
Total	112	95	124	-15.2%	30.5%

Chart 95/Table 127: DJS Out-of-State Non-Community-Based Gender Trends



DJS Out-of-State Non-Community-Based Race Trends				Percent Change	
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
American Indian / Alaskan	0	1	0	NA	-100.0%
Asian	2	0	1	-100.0%	NA
Black or African American	92	78	104	-15.2%	33.3%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	17	12	12	-29.4%	0.0%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	0	0	0	NA	NA
Other	1	4	6	300.0%	50.0%
Unknown	0	0	1	NA	NA
Total	112	95	124	-15.2%	30.5%


Chart 96/Table 128: DJS Out-of-State Non-Community-Based Race Trends

Chart 94/Table 126 (on page 124) shows that the proportion of youth in out-of-State placement ages 18 and older increased from 30% on 1/31/09 to 36% on 1/31/11. The percentages of the 18 and above population also increased by 6% from 1/31/09 to 1/31/10, and increased by 25% from 1/31/10 to 1/31/11.

A majority of the out-of-home population is male ranging from 95% as of 1/31/09 to 99% as of 1/31/11. There was a 17% decline of 107 to 89 male youth from 1/31/09 to 1/31/10 and a 38% increase of 89 to 123 from 1/31/10 to 1/31/11.


As of 1/31/2011, African American youth accounted for 84% of the total count and White youth accounted for 10%. African American youth decreased by 15% from 1/31/09 to 1/31/10 then increased by 33% from 1/31/10 to 1/31/11. The White youth population decreased by 29 % from 1/3/1/09 to 1/31/10 and remained the same from 1/31/10 to 1/31/11. The “Other” race category includes Hispanic youth. This group of youth has increased from one youth to 6 since 1/31/2009.

Placement Costs:



DJS Non-Community-Based Total Cost Trends				Percent Change	
Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	\$29,577	\$41,686	\$48,723	40.9%	16.9%
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	\$25,931,331	\$24,558,717	\$25,367,344	-5.3%	3.3%
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	\$2,821,455	\$2,627,642	\$3,197,330	-6.9%	21.7%
Residential Treatment Centers	\$10,329,968	\$9,249,665	\$8,965,749	-10.5%	-3.1%
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	\$3,305,171	\$2,707,437	\$4,227,943	-18.1%	56.2%
Total	\$42,417,502	\$39,185,147	\$41,807,089	-7.6%	6.7%

Chart 97/Table 129: DJS Non-Community-Based Total Cost Trends



DJS Non-Community-Based Cost Per Bed-Day Trends				Percent Change	
Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	\$2,112	\$1,157	\$854	-45.2%	-26.2%
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	\$334	\$357	\$311	6.9%	-12.9%
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	\$349	\$360	\$389	3.2%	8.1%
Residential Treatment Centers	\$524	\$551	\$708	5.2%	28.5%
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	\$228	\$229	\$245	0.4%	7.0%
Total	\$354	\$374	\$349	5.6%	-6.7%

Chart 98/Table 130: DJS Non-Community-Based Cost Per Bed-Day Trends

The differences between the Diagnostic average daily participation (ADP) costs are due to program selection of this group. The RTC's increased in ADP costs due to the increase in education costs.

Gaps and needs:

DJS' goal is to serve children in-State. In FY2009, DJS reopened Victor Cullen Center to accommodate high-risk youth. Additionally, the development and implementation of the MCASP has resulted in the identification of appropriate services based on a child's risk and need scores. The MCASP risk and needs assessment scores have allowed DJS workers to identify youth at high-risk levels or above and process their cases to meet their individual service needs. As a result, some youth have been diverted and moved from less-restrictive environments to secure programs. DJS plans to develop a 48-bed residential treatment facility in the Central Maryland Region. In the current FY, DJS transferred the hardware-secure program for females from the Waxter Center in Anne Arundel County to the Carter Center on the Eastern Shore to provide treatment to young women committed to DJS.


Highlights:

- Over the past three years, approximately 60% to 67% of placements were in committed non-community-based programs.
- Over the past three years, the proportion of Black/African-American youth has increased from 69% on 1/31/2009 to 72% on 1/31/2011. The proportion of White children in placement was reduced from 28% on 1/31/2009 to 23% on 1/31/2011.
- Across the three fiscal years, male placements were approximately 91% of the total youth population and the remaining 9% were female in all three FYs.
- The average age at the time of placement is 16.8 for non-community-based youth.

Recommendations

- Continue to reduce DJS' non-community-based population.
- Serve Maryland children in-State; reduce out-of-State placement for the youth.
- Expand the use of MCASP Risk Assessment tool to allow DJS workers to identify youth at high-risk levels or above and process their cases to meet their individual service needs.
- Utilize EBPs such as MST and FFT to divert youth from non-community-based programs.

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND MENTAL HYGIENE
ALCOHOL AND DRUG AND ABUSE ADMINISTRATION
(ADAA)**



ADAA Placements by Subcategory, 1/31/2011	
Subcategory	Placements
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	0
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	0
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	0
Residential Educational Facilities	0
Residential Treatment Centers	0
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	204
Living Arrangement - Non-Community-Based	0

Chart 99/Table 131: ADAA Placements by Subcategory, 1/31/2011

In Maryland, State-funded substance abuse treatment is delivered through a network of services defined through the standards set by the American Society of Addiction Medicine (ASAM) Patient Placement Criteria. These standards ensure increased uniformity of treatment and cost-effective allocation of resources.

The residential ASAM levels of care to which children/youth are admitted include:


Level III.1 – Clinically-Managed Low-Intensity Residential – outpatient or intensive outpatient treatment services in a residential setting such as a halfway house. Twenty-two placements were active at this level on January 31, 2011, which is available only to patients aged 18 and older.

Level III.3 – Clinically-Managed Medium-Intensity Residential – programs provide a structured recovery environment in combination with clinical services, such as a therapeutic rehabilitation facility offering long-term care. Seven placements were active at this level.

Level III.5 – Clinically-Managed High-Intensity Residential – a structured therapeutic community providing a recovery environment in combination with intense clinical services. Forty-five placements were active at this level.

Level III.7 – Medically-Monitored Intensive Inpatient Treatment – programs offer a planned regimen of 24-hour professionally directed evaluation, care and treatment for addicted patients in an inpatient setting. Services may include detoxification (**Level III.7.D**). Level III.7 care is delivered by an interdisciplinary staff to patients whose sub-acute biomedical and emotional/behavioral problems are sufficiently severe to require inpatient care. One-hundred twenty-five patients were placed active in Level III.7, which has an average length of stay less than a month and a high turnover rate. Seven placements were active in detoxification.

During FY2011, patients under age 21 dis-enrolled from residential treatment spent averages of 84 days in Level III.1, 52 days in III.3, 106 days in III.5, 25 days in III.7 and seven days in III.7.D. For 39% of III.1 dis-enrollments, 67% of III.3, 48% of III.5, 77% of III.7 and 85% of III.7.D, the reason for disenrollment was reported as completed treatment plan and/or transferred/referred.



ADAA Non-Community-Based Placement Trends				Percent Change	
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	0	0	0	NA	NA
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	0	0	0	NA	NA
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Educational Facilities	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Treatment Centers	0	0	0	NA	NA
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	181	208	204	14.9%	-1.9%
Living Arrangement - Non-Community-Based	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	181	208	204	14.9%	-1.9%

Chart 100/Table 132: ADAA Non-Community-Based Placement Trends

The change in numbers of placements is not significant given the relatively small portion of the substance-abuse treatment population involved.

Population Flow:

ADAA Placement Population Flow - All Placements (count of placements, not children)					
State Fiscal Year	Placements at Start of FY	Starts in FY (New Placements)	Total Served	Ends in FY (Placement Exits)	Placements at End of FY
2009	186	2089	2275	2076	199
2010	199	2378	2577	2376	201
2011	201	2283	2484	2247	237
Two Year Change	8.1%	9.3%	9.2%	8.2%	19.1%
Average Yearly Change	4.0%	4.6%	4.6%	4.1%	9.5%
Recent Year Change	1.0%	-4.0%	-3.6%	-5.4%	17.9%

Table 133: ADAA Placement Population Flow - All Placements (count of placements, not children)

There is an increase in patients served, which is consistent with the trend in overall numbers of patients entering the substance-abuse treatment network, and a trend toward greater reliance on a continuum of levels of care to treat patients. Successful management of patient flow to the level of care required at various points in the disease progression and recovery process is critical to sustaining the gains made in arresting the progression of the disease and reducing co-morbidity. During FY2011, 93% of patients under age 21 who completed and or were transferred or referred from Level III.7.D were enrolled in the data system in another level of care within 30 days, 32% of those from III.7, 53% of those from III.6 and 45% of those dis-enrolled from Level III.5.


ADAA Rate of Entry by Jurisdiction						
Jurisdiction	2009	2010	2011	Two-Year Change	Average Change	One-Year Change
Allegany	1.4	1.2	1.7	22%	11%	45%
Anne Arundel	1.7	1.7	1.4	-15%	-7%	-16%
Baltimore	1.0	1.4	1.5	49%	25%	5%
Baltimore City	1.6	1.8	1.9	18%	9%	1%
Calvert	1.9	3.0	2.3	17%	9%	-24%
Caroline	3.6	3.1	4.4	22%	11%	38%
Carroll	0.7	2.2	2.5	247%	124%	16%
Cecil	1.8	2.7	3.3	81%	41%	19%
Charles	1.2	1.8	1.2	-2%	-1%	-36%
Dorchester	2.4	2.9	2.3	-5%	-2%	-22%
Frederick	0.9	1.6	1.6	77%	38%	5%
Garrett	1.1	0.8	0.4	-62%	-31%	-50%
Harford	1.1	1.0	1.5	40%	20%	48%
Howard	0.7	0.9	0.8	23%	12%	-7%
Kent	6.8	3.6	2.7	-60%	-30%	-25%
Montgomery	1.0	1.2	0.8	-21%	-10%	-33%
Prince George's	0.5	0.5	0.5	-5%	-2%	-2%
Queen Anne's	3.1	4.0	3.3	4%	2%	-18%
Somerset	0.5	2.6	0.8	68%	34%	-69%
St. Mary's	1.3	1.1	1.9	42%	21%	75%
Talbot	4.7	2.8	3.6	-24%	-12%	26%
Washington	1.2	1.1	1.3	5%	2%	15%
Wicomico	2.5	2.5	2.9	14%	7%	16%
Worcester	1.8	4.0	2.9	59%	30%	-28%
Total	1.4	1.6	1.5	10%	5%	-4%

Table 134: ADAA Rate of Entry by Jurisdiction

* *The values for 2011 were produced by applying estimates of change in the population between April 1 and July 1 of 2010 to the 2010 Census counts. Further details on this methodology are available at: http://www.census.gov/popest/methodology/intercensal_nat_meth.pdf.*


Most of the residential facilities that serve children/youth receive referrals on a regional or Statewide basis; it is expected that rates of entry by jurisdiction will vary from year to year. The largest increase, in Carroll County, is associated with the opening of a new residential facility.

Population Demographics:




ADAA Non-Community-Based Age Trends				Percent Change	
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
0 through 5	0	0	0	NA	NA
6 through 11	0	0	0	NA	NA
12 through 17	87	83	85	-4.6%	2.4%
18 and over	94	125	119	33.0%	-4.8%
Total	181	208	204	14.9%	-1.9%

Chart 101/Table 135: ADAA Non-Community-Based Age Trends



ADAA Non-Community-Based Gender Trends				Percent Change	
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Male	144	154	153	6.9%	-0.6%
Female	37	54	51	45.9%	-5.6%
Unknown	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	181	208	204	14.9%	-1.9%

Chart 102/Table 136: ADAA Non-Community-Based Gender Trends



ADAA Non-Community-Based Race Trends				Percent Change	
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
American Indian / Alaskan	0	1	0	NA	-100.0%
Asian	1	2	1	100.0%	-50.0%
Black or African American	65	53	65	-18.5%	22.6%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	111	146	133	31.5%	-8.9%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	0	0	1	NA	NA
Other	4	6	4	50.0%	-33.3%
Unknown	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	181	208	204	14.9%	-1.9%

Chart 103/Table 137: ADAA Non-Community-Based Race Trends

The percentage of placement children/youth who were White increased from FY 2008 to FY2011 and the percentage of children/youth ages 17 and younger declined. The proportion of females increased from 26 to 31% over the three years. Admissions to Level III.5 under age 21 were predominantly under age 18 while those to Levels III.1 and 3 were exclusively ages 18 to 20. Approximately 35 % of Level III.7 admissions and 6 % of III.7.D admissions were under 18, so the age distribution represents a mix of factors. About 57% of outpatient admissions under age 21 were under 18. The predominance of males in this population is similar to that found in outpatient treatment. On the other hand, 46% of outpatient admissions were Black/African-American, compared to about one-third of the residential placements.

Placement by Jurisdiction:

DHMH-ADAA: All Placement Categories and Subcategories																												
Placement Jurisdiction																												
Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	5	2.5%	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	9	4.4%	1	2	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	21	10.3%	4	4	4	1	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Baltimore City	33	16.2%	3	2	8	9	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Calvert	6	2.9%	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	5	2.5%	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	11	5.4%	5	0	2	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	7	3.4%	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	5	2.5%	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	3	1.5%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	6	2.9%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	9	4.4%	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Howard	4	2.0%	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	1	0.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	17	8.3%	3	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
Prince George's	12	5.9%	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queen Anne's	3	1.5%	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	1	0.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	4	2.0%	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Talbot	3	1.5%	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Washington	2	1.0%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	5	2.5%	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Worcester	3	1.5%	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	29	14.2%	2	1	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	204	100.0%	44	18	50	10	1	0	25	0	0	5	3	0	12	2	4	3	5	0	0	3	0	19	0	0	0	0
% of placements from jurisdiction			80.0%	22.2%	19.0%	27.3%	0.0%	0.0%	36.4%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	0.0%	11.1%	50.0%	0.0%	17.6%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			21.6%	8.8%	24.5%	4.9%	0.5%	0.0%	12.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	1.5%	0.0%	5.9%	1.0%	2.0%	1.5%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	9.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Table 138: ADAA Placement by Jurisdiction, FY2011 on January 31, 2011

As noted above, for the most part, placements are made on a regional or Statewide basis according to the individual needs of the patient. Particular residential levels of care are available in every jurisdiction.

Placement Costs:




Chart 104/Table 139: ADAA Non-Community-Based Total Cost Trends




Chart 105/Table 140: ADAA Non-Community-Based Cost Per Bed-Day Trends


These bed-day costs are expected to fluctuate given the relatively small portion of the population pool represented by these placements.

Conclusions:

Prescription drugs, primarily opiate painkillers and benzodiazepines, remains the fastest-growing category of substances abused among this population. Prescription-opiates, primarily Oxycodone, went from affecting 24% of the placements in FY2009 to 40% in 2011, overtaking alcohol in its impact on this population. Benzodiazepines increased from 5% to 10% during that period. Children/youth admitted to treatment with prescription-drug problems were primarily White. But the most prevalent substance of abuse remains marijuana, affecting 75% of the children/youth placed. Approximately one-third had problems with both alcohol and marijuana. Heroin problems increased from 21% to 28% over the three years, and injecting drug use went from 17% to 28% of the under-age 21 residential- treatment placements. Patients in this age group admitted with heroin problems primarily inject the drug and are predominantly White.

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND MENTAL HYGIENE
MENTAL HYGIENE ADMINISTRATION (MHA)**

Population Totals:



MHA Placements by Subcategory, 1/31/2011	
Subcategory	Placements
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	0
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	0
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	0
Residential Educational Facilities	0
Residential Treatment Centers	434
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	0
Living Arrangement - Non-Community-Based	0

Chart 106/Table 141: MHA Placements by Subcategory, 1/31/2011


All MHA placements are funded by Medical Assistance with a State and federal Medicaid dollar match. “Residential Treatment Centers” represent the only placement subcategory used by MHA since it is the only non-community-based placement that is funded by Medical Assistance. A residential treatment center is often referred to as an “RTC” or as a “psychiatric residential treatment facility” (PRTF), using federal government nomenclature. Medical Assistance is often referred to simply as “MA,” or as “Medicaid,” again using federal government nomenclature.

DHR and DJS may also place children with MA in residential placements, so the 1/31/2011 MHA Placements by Subcategory number actually includes children from DHR and DJR as well as children/youth from MHA. Historically, children/youth placed by MHA in residential treatment constitute about 40% of all children placed in RTCs that are funded through Medical Assistance.

However, regardless of the placing Agency, all children whose mental health treatment is funded through Medical Assistance are served through Maryland’s public mental health system (PMHS), including RTC care. The PMHS is administered by MHA through an “Administrative

Services Organization” (ASO) that manages mental health care, including all Medical Assistance funded care in the RTCs. The ASO manages RTC admissions as well as ongoing RTC care to ensure that children meet the medical-necessity criteria and require the RTC-level of care, which is the most restrictive level of care. MHA is committed to the treatment of all individuals in the least restrictive setting consistent with their treatment needs.

Although MHA places only about 40% of the children whose RTC care is funded through Medical Assistance, MHA monitors and manages the care of all of these children regardless of the placing Agency. Therefore, in that sense, all RTC children are MHA children.



MHA Non-Community-Based Placement Trends				Percent Change	
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	0	0	0	NA	NA
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Educational Facilities	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Treatment Centers	534	482	434	-9.7%	-10.0%
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	0	0	0	NA	NA
Living Arrangement - Non-Community-Based	0	0	0	NA	NA

Chart 107/Table 142: MHA Non-Community-Based Placement Trends

The yearly trend of one-day counts for the RTC placement category shows decreases of approximately 10% in each of the last two years. This is because Maryland has developed a community-based alternative to RTCs through the federal Medicaid process known as a “Section 1915(c) Home and Community-Based Services Waiver.”


The federal government has specifically encouraged development of alternatives to the standard RTC or PRTF in order to promote treatment in the community and approved Maryland’s 1915c Psychiatric Residential Treatment Facility Waiver (RTC Waiver) proposal. Maryland began

enrolling children/youth into this community-based alternative in FY2010. The number of children/youth enrolled in the RTC Waiver was 60 in FY2010 and 166 in FY2011.

All children who require a RTC level of care are eligible to be considered for the RTC Waiver in the community regardless of which Agency is placing the child as long as it has been determined that the child can be safely treated in the community through the development of an appropriate plan of care (POC) that includes community-based services to meet the child’s needs.

Also contributing to the decrease in the number of children in RTCs, the length of stay in the RTC-level of care has been gradually declining over the past several years. This has been due in part to an MHA effort to have children move from the RTCs to community treatment as soon as their clinical needs can safely be met at a lower level of care. This is accomplished through both monitoring progress in the RTC and providing technical assistance in discharge planning.


Population Demographics:



MHA Non-Community-Based Age Trends				Percent Change	
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
0 through 5	0	0	0	NA	NA
6 through 11	53	32	48	-39.6%	50.0%
12 through 17	443	406	348	-8.4%	-14.3%
18 and over	38	44	38	15.8%	-13.6%
Total	534	482	434	-9.7%	-10.0%

Chart 108/Table 143: MHA Non-Community-Based Age Trends

As noted earlier, all MHA non-community-based placements are in RTCs and the MHA non-community-based age trends total percentage changes (Y1-Y2) and (Y2-Y3) result from the movement of children/youth from RTCs into community treatment through the RTC Waiver. However, these changes have been different over time for different age groups and percentage changes have been larger in those age groups with smaller numbers.




MHA Non-Community-Based Gender Trends				Percent Change	
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Male	331	276	264	-16.6%	-4.3%
Female	203	205	170	1.0%	-17.1%
Unknown	0	1	0	NA	-100.0%
Total	534	482	434	-9.7%	-10.0%

Chart 109/Table 144: MHA Non-Community-Based Gender Trends

The MHA non-community-based gender trends percentage changes (Y1-Y2) and (Y2-Y3) are the result of the movement of children/youth from RTCs into community treatment through the RTC Waiver. However, males, who represent the majority of those in RTCs, were those most often transferred to the RTC Waiver during FY2010 and referrals of females to the RTC Waiver subsequently increased significantly during FY2011.

It should be noted that, upon further investigation, the gender of the “unknown” youth was determined to be male.



MHA Non-Community-Based Race Trends				Percent Change	
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
American Indian / Alaskan	0	0	3	NA	NA
Asian	2	2	2	0.0%	0.0%
Black or African American	287	263	225	-8.4%	-14.4%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	221	193	170	-12.7%	-11.9%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	0	0	0	NA	NA
Other	23	24	34	4.3%	41.7%
Unknown	1	0	0	-100.0%	NA
Total	534	482	434	-9.7%	-10.0%

Chart 110/Table 145: MHA Non-Community-Based Race Trends

MHA non-community-based race trends total percentage changes result from movement of children/youth from RTCs into community-based treatment including the RTC Waiver. Black or African American and White categories represent the great majority of children/youth in RTCs. Black or African American children/youth are historically over-represented in RTC placements just as these youth are over-represented in juvenile justice and child welfare placements (disproportionate minority contact). The “Other” category represents the “Bi-Racial/Multiple Race” category, which is increasing.

Please note that the “Unknown” category entry represents one case in which race data was not provided.

Placement by Jurisdiction:

DHMH-MHA: All Placement Categories and Subcategories																												
Placement Jurisdiction																												
Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	
Allegany	6	1.4%	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Anne Arundel	27	6.2%	0	10	11	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Baltimore	105	24.2%	0	0	19	80	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Baltimore City	95	21.9%	0	2	43	41	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		
Calvert	2	0.5%	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Caroline	2	0.5%	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Carroll	4	0.9%	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Cecil	9	2.1%	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Charles	8	1.8%	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Dorchester	18	4.1%	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Frederick	37	8.5%	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Garrett	2	0.5%	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Harford	11	2.5%	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Howard	3	0.7%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Kent	1	0.2%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Montgomery	48	11.1%	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Prince George's	19	4.4%	0	3	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Queen Anne's	1	0.2%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Somerset	1	0.2%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
St. Mary's	7	1.6%	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Talbot	3	0.7%	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Washington	10	2.3%	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Wicomico	8	1.8%	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Worcester	3	0.7%	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
OOS	4	0.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Grand Total	434	100.0%	0	22	106	172	0	0	0	0	0	37	48	0	0	0	0	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	
% of placements from jurisdiction			0.0%	37.0%	18.1%	43.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	72.2%	78.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	68.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	75.0%	0.0%
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			0.0%	5.1%	24.4%	39.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.5%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%

Table 146: MHA Placement by Jurisdiction on January 31, 2011

Although placement within (or near) a child’s or youth’s home jurisdiction is one factor considered in placing a child in a RTC, the largest determinant is the child’s treatment needs. This is of importance, since some services are available in some RTCs and not in others, programming and ages and genders served are not identical across facilities, and whether the program has a vacancy at the time of referral or anticipates one within a reasonable time frame.

Furthermore, there are only 11 RTCs located in Maryland and these are not uniformly located across the State. Accordingly, children/youth from many jurisdictions will necessarily be placed outside their jurisdiction. In-State RTCs are located in Baltimore County (4), Baltimore City (2), Montgomery County (2), and in Anne Arundel, Dorchester, and Frederick Counties (one in each jurisdiction).

Finally, with the exception of two facilities that are administered by MHA, each RTC, whether in-State or out-of-State, is an business entity independent of MHA and determines which children/youth will be admitted. Even in the two RTCs administered by MHA, there are programming and vacancy constraints that govern admissions.




Chart 111/Table 147: MHA Out-of-State Non-Community-Based Placement Trends

For certain treatment needs and child/youth characteristics, there are no in-State RTCs that provide for and will accept children/youth with those needs or characteristics. Some typical examples are children/youth who require treatment for fire-setting or those who require treatment for sexually offensive behavior and whose intellectual functioning falls below a specified level. In those cases, children/youth may necessarily be placed in an out-of-State RTC.

Nevertheless, there are continuing efforts to find in-State RTC beds for children/youth whose appropriate treatment requires that level of care. Progress has been made over the last two fiscal

years in reducing the number of children/youth admitted both to in-State and out-of-State RTCs. This has been accomplished through a combination of serving more children/youth in the community with intensive services and a gradual development of expanded treatment programming in some of the in-State RTCs. These actions have resulted in less frequent referrals for out-of-State placement.

Placement Costs:




Chart 112/Table 148: MHA Non-Community-Based Total Cost Trends

The figures in this chart represent the total Medical Assistance costs for all RTC placements. They include the residential placement costs for children/youth placed by MHA, as well as all the residential placement costs for those DHR and DJS children whose placement is funded through Medical Assistance rather than Agency funding. These costs vary by the number of children (MHA, DHR and DJS) who are placed, by the placement since the programs can receive different reimbursement, and these costs typically will vary year to year.

The RTC costs for children/youth placed by MHA in RTCs are: for FY2009: \$68,675,194; for FY 2101: \$53,936,883; and for FY2011: \$51,929,516. The percent change for these MHA placements for (Y1-Y2) is -27.3% and for (Y2-Y3) is -3.9%. The MHA non-community-based cost trends show decreases that result from the gradual movement of children/youth from RTCs to community treatment through the RTC Waiver.

Just as the number of all children in RTCs has gradually declined, the number of MHA-placed children/youth in RTCs has declined over the past two years. The proportion of the total MA cost for RTC placements for children/youth placed by MHA has declined from 73% (FY2009), to 59% (FY2010), and to 51% (FY2011), as these MHA placement numbers have declined.




Chart 113/Table 149: MHA Non-Community-Based Cost Per Bed-Day Trends

The figures in this chart represent the total Medical Assistance costs for all children placed in RTCs divided by the number of bed-days (the total number of days in residential treatment for all children placed in RTCs). These figures include the residential placement costs per bed-day for children/youth placed by MHA, but they also include the residential placement costs per bed-day for those DHR and DJS children whose placement is funded through Medical Assistance instead of Agency funding. These bed-day costs vary primarily due to utilization of RTCs with costs which may be higher or lower than average due to different programming and these costs can vary year to year.

While the cost per bed-day for children/youth placed by MHA is generally similar to those for all Medical Assistance RTC placements, the out-of-State RTCs approved as Maryland Medical Assistance providers utilized by DHR and DJS are often of relatively higher cost than those most often utilized by MHA. Finally, as the number of MHA RTC placements has declined, the MHA portion of the total (Medical Assistance) cost per bed-day for RTC placements for children/youth placed by MHA has also necessarily declined.

Conclusions:


The current capacity of RTCs in Maryland appears adequate to meet the needs for this level of care for Maryland children/youth during the foreseeable future, as indicated by vacancy rates for the in-State RTCs. It would seem desirable to have the Maryland RTCs offer more options for specialized treatment such as treatment for fire-setting and sexually offensive behavior, especially for children/youth with limited intellectual functioning. However, whether there would be enough of these referrals to make financial sense for an in-State RTC to develop such programming appears unlikely at this time.

Efforts to minimize the number of Maryland children/youth in out-of-State placements will continue. However, it appears likely that for a small number of children/youth with needs for specialized care or who are in complicated circumstances, an out-of-State placement will continue to be necessary.

Over the past two years, significant numbers of Maryland children/youth have been able to move from institutional placements in RTCs into community treatment through the RTC Waiver initiative. Maryland's RTC Waiver is a federal Medicaid "Section 1915(c) Home and Community-Based Services Waiver" promoted by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services for this very purpose. It is a "demonstration waiver" that ends is slated to end on September 30, 2012. As a sustainability option for this population, MHA is currently developing a proposal for a Section 1915(i) Medicaid State Plan Amendment, a new, permanent Medicaid alternative to providing comprehensive long-term services in institutional settings. MHA plans to continue to expand the availability of these community-based placements for Maryland children and youth.


MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (MSDE)

Population Totals:



MSDE Placements by Subcategory, 1/31/2011	
Subcategory	Placements
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	0
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	0
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	0
Residential Educational Facilities	44
Residential Treatment Centers	22
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	0
Living Arrangement - Non-Community-Based	0

Chart 114/Table 150: MSDE Placements by Subcategory, 1/31/2011



MSDE Non-Community-Based Placement Trends				Percent Change	
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	0	0	0	NA	NA
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	0	0	0	NA	NA
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Educational Facilities	51	58	44	13.7%	-24.1%
Residential Treatment Centers	47	37	22	-21.3%	-40.5%
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	0	0	0	NA	NA
Living Arrangement - Non-Community-Based	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	98	95	66	-3.1%	-30.5%

Chart 115/Table 151: MSDE Non-Community-Based Placement Trends

The location for the delivery of special education and related services for children in residential placements is determined through the Individualized Education Program (IEP) team process. These students require a residential setting in order to implement the IEP. Local School Systems (LSSs) are required to provide a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) for all students who require special education and related services. The IEP team is charged with ensuring that the child is demonstrating educational progress in the approved placement. The IEP team, including the parent, may determine at any time that a change in placement is necessary to implement the IEP and to provide FAPE.

Population Flow:

MSDE Placement Population Flow - All Placements (count of placements, not children)					
State Fiscal Year	Placements at Start of FY	Starts in FY (New Placements)	Total Served	Ends in FY (Placement Exits)	Placements at End of FY
2009	73	39	112	29	83
2010	68	28	96	26	70
2011	49	20	69	11	58
Two Year Change	-32.9%	-48.7%	-38.4%	-62.1%	-30.1%
Average Yearly Change	-16.4%	-24.4%	-19.2%	-31.0%	-15.1%
Recent Year Change	-27.9%	-28.6%	-28.1%	-57.7%	-17.1%

Table 152: MSDE Placement Population Flow - All Placements (count of placements, not children)

* The values for 2011 were produced by applying estimates of change in the population between April 1 and July 1 of 2010 to the 2010 Census counts. Further details on this methodology are available at: http://www.census.gov/popest/methodology/intercensal_nat_meth.pdf.

The LSSs have a minimal number of students in residential placements. The LSSs are bound by the federal law, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), to implement the IEP in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) where special education and related services can be provided to ensure a FAPE. In some cases this requires a residential setting. A student is placed in a residential setting by a LSS only when it is necessary to implement the IEP. The ratio of students requiring residential placement in order to implement the IEP is 0% - 0.001% even in the large jurisdictions. The actual number of placements is a better indicator of the trends in each jurisdiction than the percentage.

Population Demographics:






Chart 116/Table 153: MSDE Non-Community-Based Age Trends



MSDE Non-Community-Based Gender Trends				Percent Change	
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Male	77	72	48	-6.5%	-33.3%
Female	21	23	18	9.5%	-21.7%
Unknown	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	98	95	66	-3.1%	-30.5%

Chart 117/Table 154: MSDE Non-Community-Based Gender Trends



MSDE Non-Community-Based Race Trends				Percent Change	
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
American Indian / Alaskan	0	0	0	NA	NA
Asian	3	3	2	0.0%	-33.3%
Black or African American	25	27	15	8.0%	-44.4%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	2	NA	NA
White	67	61	47	-9.0%	-23.0%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	0	0	0	NA	NA
Other	3	4	0	33.3%	-100.0%
Unknown	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	98	95	66	-3.1%	-30.5%


Chart 118/Table 155: MSDE Non-Community-Based Race Trends

Placement by Jurisdiction:

MSDE: All Placement Categories and Subcategories																												
Placement Jurisdiction																												
Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	6	9.1%	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Baltimore	9	13.6%	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Baltimore City	7	10.6%	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Calvert	1	1.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	1	1.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	1	1.5%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	1	1.5%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	4	6.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	1	1.5%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	2	3.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	2	3.0%	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	19	28.8%	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0
Prince George's	12	18.2%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	66	100.0%	0	0	1	1	0	16	0	8	0	0	1	0	0	7	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	0
% of placements from jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	31.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	1.5%	0.0%	24.2%	0.0%	12.1%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	10.6%	0.0%	15.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%

Table 156: MSDE Placement by Jurisdiction on January 31, 2011


The “Placement by Jurisdictions” chart reflects the location of programs for students who require a residential educational school. Caroline, Cecil, Howard, and Montgomery County each have designated at least one provider that has a residential school component for children/youth who require residential special education and related services to implement an IEP. The students served have been identified with the primary disability of autism. The data indicate that the children who require a residential educational school setting are 12-21 years of age. More than 50% of children/youth requiring a residential educational setting are 18 or older. The LSSs are required to provide special education and related services through the school year in which the child turns 21. These services include Transition planning and coordination to appropriate adult services.



MSDE Out-of-State Non-Community-Based Placement Trends				Percent Change	
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	0	0	0	NA	NA
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	0	0	0	NA	NA
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Educational Facilities	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Treatment Centers	47	37	22	-21.3%	-40.5%
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	0	0	0	NA	NA
Living Arrangement - Non-Community-Based	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	47	37	22	-21.3%	-40.5%

Chart 119/Table 157: MSDE Out-of-State Non-Community-Based Placement Trends


MSDE Out of State by Non-Community Based Age Group, 1/31/2011



MSDE Out-of-State Non-Community-Based Age Trends				Percent Change	
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
0 through 5	0	0	0	NA	NA
6 through 11	2	1	1	-50.0%	0.0%
12 through 17	19	9	7	-52.6%	-22.2%
18 and over	26	27	14	3.8%	-48.1%
Total	47	37	22	-21.3%	-40.5%


Chart 120/Table 158: MSDE Out-of-State Non-Community-Based Age Trends

MSDE Out of State by Non-Community Based Gender, 1/31/2011



MSDE Out-of-State Non-Community-Based Gender Trends				Percent Change	
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Male	37	31	15	-16.2%	-51.6%
Female	10	6	7	-40.0%	16.7%
Unknown	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	47	37	22	-21.3%	-40.5%

Chart 121/Table 159: MSDE Out-of-State Non-Community-Based Gender Trends



MSDE Out-of-State Non-Community-Based Race Trends				Percent Change	
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
American Indian / Alaskan	0	0	0	NA	NA
Asian	0	0	0	NA	NA
Black or African American	12	10	8	-16.7%	-20.0%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	34	25	14	-26.5%	-44.0%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	0	0	0	NA	NA
Other	1	2	0	100.0%	-100.0%
Unknown	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	47	37	22	-21.3%	-40.5%

Chart 122/Table 160: MSDE Out-of-State Non-Community-Based Race Trends

Occasionally, the physical location for the delivery of special education and related services for children who require a residential educational setting to implement the IEP is in an out-of-State program. One-third of the children in residential settings are out-of-State. The IEP team must consider the proximity to the child's home. In some cases, the out-of-State program is closer to the child's home than an in-State program. For the remaining out-of-State placements, the major factor is that there is not an available in-State placement. Many of the children who require a residential setting for educational purposes require more than one year of such programming. They often remain in the residential educational setting until the end of the year in which they turn 21 years of age.

MSDE has been working diligently to engage in partnerships with providers to enhance the options for in-State programming. MSDE has partnered with the University of Maryland's Center for Mental Health to provide school-based mental health counseling in Baltimore City and Prince George's County Public Schools. This has decreased the number of children requiring day placements outside their community schools. MSDE also partners for mental health services in Harford County Public Schools with Upper Bay Counseling. MSDE partners with a number of Nonpublic Special Education Schools to provide special education and related services in the public school setting rather than transporting the children to separate buildings.

Placement Costs:




Chart 123/Table 161: MSDE Non-Community-Based Total Cost Trends

Conclusions:

The largest gap for children in Maryland is providing services for children with autism and other related disabilities. These children often require intensive and long-term programming. Due to the intense level of support in residential programming, these children/youth do not generally return to a public school setting before they age out of the school system. MSDE has been working with a number of in-State providers to expand their programs. Most recently, the Chimes has added a program for 18-21-year-old students. The LSSs and the Chimes are working together to return students in out-of-State placements to Maryland to facilitate the transition to adult services. Many current providers are slowly expanding their services to include children at a younger age and to continue into the adult services.

Section VI: Hospitalizations

Overview

This section provides an analysis of the number of placements in hospitalizations. This includes a Statewide summary and analysis by each of the placing/funding Agencies represented in this category. Hospitalizations include the following placements: General Hospitalization and Psychiatric Hospitalization. Hospitalization placements were reported by DHR and DJS only.

Definitions

General Hospitalization: Hospitalization for a medical (non-psychiatric) illness or injury.

Psychiatric Hospitalization: Hospitalization for a mental health disorder/emergency.

Hospitalizations: Number of Placements on January 31, 2011

Table 162 (page 158) provides an overview of the number of placements reported in the single-day count by jurisdiction and location of placement. The first column provides the number of out-of-home placements from the home jurisdiction on the single-day count. The second column provides the percentage that number represents with regard to the total number of Statewide placements on that date. The columns that follow provide the name of the jurisdiction where the placement occurred. The rows at the bottom of the table provide the percentage of placements from the jurisdiction that are also placed in that jurisdiction. The final row provides the percentage of placements in that jurisdiction, out of the total number of Statewide placements reported on that date.

Hospitalizations: Number of Placements on January 31, 2011 by Home and Placement Jurisdiction


Hospitalizations: All Subcategories

Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Placement Jurisdiction																									
			Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	1	2.3%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	2	4.7%	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	4	9.3%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Baltimore City	7	16.3%	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Calvert	1	2.3%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	2	4.7%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	1	2.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Dorchester	2	4.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Frederick	2	4.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	1	2.3%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	2	4.7%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Howard	1	2.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Kent	1	2.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	2	4.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prince George's	4	9.3%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queen Anne's	1	2.3%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	1	2.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
St. Mary's	1	2.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	1	2.3%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	2	4.7%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	2	4.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Worcester	2	4.7%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	43	100.0%	1	0	12	2	0	1	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	5	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	8
% of placements from jurisdiction			100.0%	0.0%	25.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	75.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
% placements statewide in all			2.3%	0.0%	27.9%	4.7%	0.0%	2.3%	4.7%	0.0%	0.0%	7.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.7%	2.3%	4.7%	11.6%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	4.7%	0.0%	0.0%	18.6%

Table 162: Hospitalizations on January 31, 2011


Hospitalizations Statewide Summary

There were 43 children in hospitalization placements on the single-day count. 88.4% of the hospitalizations were made by DHR and 11.6% by DJS.



Placements By Agency, 1/31/2011	
Agency	Placements
ADAA	0
DDA	0
DHR	38
DJS	5
MHA	0
MSDE	0

Chart 124/Table 163: Hospitalizations By Agency, 1/31/2011




All Agencies Hospitalization Placement Trends				Percent Change	
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
In-Patient Private	7	6	16	-14.3%	166.7%
Psychiatric Hospitalization	22	25	27	13.6%	8.0%
Total	29	31	43	6.9%	38.7%

Chart 125/Table 164: All Agencies Hospitalization Placement Trends

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES (DHR)


Less than 1% of all DHR placements include children/youth in hospital placements, including both medical and psychiatric hospitalizations.

Population Totals:



DHR Placements by Subcategory, 1/31/2011	
Subcategory	Placements
In-Patient Private	16
Psychiatric Hospitalization	22

Chart 126/Table 165: DHR Placements by Subcategory, 1/31/2011




DHR Hospitalization Placement Trends				Percent Change	
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
In-Patient Private	7	6	16	-14.3%	166.7%
Psychiatric Hospitalization	14	17	22	21.4%	29.4%
Total	21	23	38	9.5%	65.2%

Chart 127/Table 166: DHR Hospitalization Placement Trends

Due to extremely low numbers of children in hospitalizations and the short-term nature of many hospitalizations, caution must be used when analyzing trends in this category.


Population Demographics:



DHR Hospitalization Age Trends				Percent Change	
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
0 through 5	2	3	4	50.0%	33.3%
6 through 11	2	0	5	-100.0%	NA
12 through 17	15	16	24	6.7%	50.0%
18 and over	2	4	5	100.0%	25.0%
Total	21	23	38	9.5%	65.2%

Chart 128/Table 167: DHR Hospitalization Age Trends


The proportion of youth ages 12 through 17 in hospitalization settings is slightly higher than the proportion of that age group in the overall DHR out-of-home population.



DHR Hospitalization Gender Trends				Percent Change	
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
Male	8	8	23	0.0%	187.5%
Female	13	15	15	15.4%	0.0%
Unknown*	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	21	23	38	9.5%	65.2%

Chart 129/Table 168: DHR Hospitalization Gender Trends

Unlike other categories, females outnumber males in hospitalization placements on the selected one-day counts.



DHR Hospitalization Race Trends				Percent Change	
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	(Y1-Y2)	(Y2-Y3)
American Indian / Alaskan	0	1	0	NA	-100.0%
Asian	0	0	0	NA	NA
Black or African American	10	12	15	20.0%	25.0%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	1	0	NA	-100.0%
White	8	7	15	-12.5%	114.3%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	2	1	7	-50.0%	600.0%
Other	1	1	0	0.0%	-100.0%
Unknown*	0	0	1	NA	NA
Total	21	23	38	9.5%	65.2%

Chart 130/Table 169: DHR Hospitalization Race Trends

*Unknown = race not identified in the child's MD CHESSIE record.

Racial breakdowns between Black/African-American and White children/youth in hospitalizations are closer than in the total DHR out-of-home population, at approximately 45% and 37% respectively.

Placement Costs:

DHR does not fund hospitalization placements. They are funded by Medicaid for children in DHR out-of-home care.

Conclusions:

There will always be a need for medical and psychiatric hospitalizations for children in Maryland, including those in DHR out-of-home care. Over the past three years, one-day count data indicates that more DHR children are in psychiatric than medical hospitalizations. Older children (ages 12-17) appear to have the highest need for these placements, indicating the continued need for intensive services for this age group. Early intervention for and recognition of mental health disorders may prevent some hospitalizations..

Section VII: Maryland School for the Blind and Maryland School for the Deaf

In accordance with § 8-303 of the Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland, MSDE, each county board, the Maryland School for the Deaf and the Maryland School for the Blind shall work together to meet the educational needs of children who are deaf or blind.

The Maryland School for the Deaf

The Maryland School for the Deaf (MSD) is established under §8-304 of the Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland. MSD is required to admit free of charge all students who are Maryland residents and meet the established admissions criteria. Section 8-305 requires each LSS to notify the parents or guardians of each hearing-impaired child of the availability of the educational programs offered by MSD. Funding for MSD is established under §8-310.3. MSD is also required to establish and operate a program of enhanced services for deaf students who have other moderate to severe disabilities under § 8-310.1 with funding provided jointly by the State and the county. The majority of students who are enrolled at MSD are placed by parents or guardians rather than by a LSS. Children receiving enhanced services* are placed by LSSs through the Individualized Education Program (IEP) team process. A small number of enrolled students live on campus weeknights during the school year, late August through early June.

The Maryland School for the Blind

The Maryland School for the Blind (MSB) is established to provide services for children placed by LSSs through the IEP team process. In accordance with § 8-307.1 each LSS in the State shall notify the parents or guardians of each blind or visually-impaired child, including children with multiple disabilities, of the availability of the educational programs and administrative policies of the schools under their jurisdiction. MSB is also required to establish and operate a program of enhanced services* for students who are blind and have other disabilities. Funding for these services is provided jointly by the State and county. The budget for MSB is submitted annually by the Governor to the General Assembly. The residential program offers a continuum of service options. Students may participate in the program on an extended-day, part-time or full-time, and may reside in a dormitory or in a house on the campus.

*Note – Enhanced services allow students to receive educational services in Maryland rather in an out-of-State residential program.

Residential Placements

Maryland School for the Blind

	Total Residential Served	Residential Cost	Educational Cost	Total Cost
FY2009	99	\$3,937,626	\$10,669,824	\$14,607,450
FY2010	86	\$4,760,670	\$7,628,494	\$12,389,164
FY2011	90	\$5,129,184	\$8,541,149	\$13,670,333

Table 170: Maryland School for the Blind Total Costs

Maryland School for the Deaf

	Total Residential Served	Residential Cost	Educational Cost	Total Cost
FY2009	129	\$2,335,339	\$5,931,494	\$8,266,833
FY2010	125	\$2,296,579	\$5,893,239	\$8,189,818
FY2011	111	\$2,253,601	\$5,031,852	\$7,285,453

Table 171: Maryland School for the Deaf Total Costs

Section VIII: Family Preservation Services

Local Departments of Social Services (LDSS) have a long tradition of providing family preservation services, where appropriate, to families presenting with moderate to serious risks of child maltreatment. Rooted in the 1980 federal child welfare law to make “reasonable efforts to prevent out-of-home placement,” Maryland has provided in-home interventions since the early 1980s. From 1990 to the present, the Interagency Family Preservation Services (IFPS) program has been implemented in Maryland as an approach to preserving families with children at imminent risk of placement from all child-serving Agencies.

Prior to FY2008, IFPS was administered by the Governor’s Office for Children, Youth and Families (the predecessor of GOC) after which IFPS was integrated into DHR’s In-Home/Family Preservation services. As part of streamlining and improving its use of assessments for In-Home/Family Preservation, DHR planned to replace the North Carolina Family Assessment Scale (NCFAS) with the Maryland Child and Adolescent Needs and Strengths (MD CANS) assessment. This plan is in the process of being revised to accommodate the need for more specific caregiver information in the design of strengths based case plans for in-home services. The current plan is to use the Family Advocacy and Support Tool (FAST), in place of the MD CANS for families receiving In-Home/Family Preservation Services. FAST is a communi-metric tool similar to the MD CANS in that it is designed to facilitate communication about the needs and strengths of families. While the MD CANS is primarily a child-focused assessment with a caregiver section, the FAST assesses the family system with a primary focus on the caregiver. The MD CANS and the FAST assessments contain both child and family rating items, with MD CANS being child-centered (for children placed in out-of-home care) and the FAST being family-focused (for children living at home with their families). During FY2012 this new assessment will be finalized and Statewide implementation is anticipated for July 1, 2012. DHR has chosen not to return to NCFAS because the FAST will provide guidance/input on service needs as part of its results. Data from the FAST will not be available until the FY2013 report in December 2013. An interim assessment used to gauge the risk of maltreatment, the Maryland Family Risk Assessment (MFRA), therefore, is being reported in this year’s report on family preservation.

Finally, DHR In-Home/Family Preservation services is undergoing a consolidation designed to streamline the in-home service system and make better use of assessment data to gauge the intensity of in-home service that a family needs. This multi-year effort involves changes to DHR’s Safety assessment (SAFE-C), the Maryland Family Risk Assessment (MFRA), and inclusion of the FAST to provide, once fully implemented, a well-rounded picture of a family’s safety, risk, and functioning that will assist with service planning. Implementation of these changes is delayed due to budget constraints impacting improvements required in MD CHESSIE in order to complement the changes in policy and practice.

DHR is in the process of transforming its In-Home/Family Preservation services policies, practices, and information system, and that transformation is ongoing. This Report contains the best available data during this time of transition.

Service Counts for DHR In-Home Services

In-Home/Family Preservation Services currently include a number of services that have been developed over the last few decades and will be consolidated. Current consolidation plans include transforming these categories into three:

- Services to Families with Children – Intake (a short-term service featuring an assessment of family needs, making it a different service than the traditional In-Home/Family Preservation service);
- Interagency Family Preservation Services; and
- In-Home/Family Preservation Services (collapsing the rest into one category for the In-Home/Family Preservation services traditionally provided by DHR).

For this Report, the data are organized as:

- All In-Home, consisting of:
 - DHR Family Preservation – all the categories currently in use, and
 - IFPS – only the one category, Interagency Family Preservation Services.

A review of the last three years' information on overall served and newly-served indicates that there has been a downward trend in the overall number of families and children served in In-Home/Family Preservation programs. Table 172 (page 167) contains data for all In-Home services, DHR Family Preservation services, and IFPS, although it should be noted that the breakdowns are only partially available for FY2009, and fully available for FY2010 and FY2011, based on MD CHESSIE data entry for these In-Home/Family Preservation cases.

Families and Children Served and Newly-Served						
In-Home, DHR Family Preservation Services, Interagency Family Preservation Services						
In-Home Services						
	All Cases Served during FY			New Cases during FY		
	Cases	Children	Child/Case	Cases	Children	Child/Case
FY2009	9,109	19,663	2.2	6,303	13,589	2.2
FY2010	7,951	17,376	2.2	5,526	11,934	2.2
FY2011	7,569	16,551	2.2	5,200	11,280	2.2
DHR Family Preservation Services						
	All Cases Served during FY			New Cases during FY		
	Cases	Children	Child/Case	Cases	Children	Child/Case
FY2009 *	8,542	18,438	2.2	5,745	12,385	2.2
FY2010	6,920	14,954	2.2	4,694	9,978	2.1
FY2011	6,610	14,291	2.2	4,428	9,471	2.1
Interagency Family Preservation Services						
	All Cases Served during FY			New Cases during FY		
	Cases	Children	Child/Case	Cases	Children	Child/Case
FY2009 *	567	1,225	2.2	558	1,204	2.2
FY2010	1,031	2,422	2.3	832	1,956	2.4
FY2011	959	2,260	2.4	772	1,809	2.3
* IFPS cases were not separately identified in MD CHESSIE in until halfway through FY2009.						
The previously reported figures for FY2009, based on LDSS raw data, are:						
FY2009: Newly Served IFPS-971; Newly-Served At-Risk Children-1,697						
FY2010 and FY2011: MD CHESSIE coding for IFPS cases was complete						

Table 172: Families and Children Served and Newly-Served

Overall, DHR In-Home served and newly-served families during the fiscal year have decreased by 17% and 18%, respectively, from FY2009 to FY2011. Internally collected raw data from LDSS offices on the number of in-home cases open at the end of each month supports this downward trend, in that there is a 12% decrease in the number of In-Home/Family Preservation cases at the beginning of FY2008 compared to the beginning of FY2012.

Concerns have been raised about the downward trend in In-Home/Family Preservation during the same time period in which DHR out-of-home foster care placements have dropped significantly as well. The reported concern is that if foster care placements are decreasing, then In-Home/Family Preservation services should be increasing. This sounds like a reasonable relationship about the service trends between in-home and out-of-home programs, however, it ignores the increasing impact of a third factor: DHR's roll-out of a new family-centered practice model over the last three years, as part of its Place Matters Initiative, featuring the use of Family Involvement Meetings. During these meetings it is often the case that solutions excluding LDSS in-home or out-of-home services are found. This makes it possible for children to remain safely at home and relatives, friends, and other resources are found to support the family on an ongoing basis.

It should also be noted that DHR In-Home/Family Preservation Services touches the lives of over 16,550 children per fiscal year. In FY2011 this is 46% more children than were served in foster care (just over 11,340 children served in foster care).

Analysis of Maryland Family Risk Assessment (MFRA) for In-Home Services

DHR In-Home/Family Preservation workers are required to complete a MFRA while the family is receiving services. An intake and closing risk assessment is required, as well as additional ratings every six months or when the family situation changes. The assessment is six pages and includes a central section wherein workers score family observations in five risk categories: (a) History of Child Maltreatment, (b) Type and Extent of Current Child Maltreatment Investigation, (c) Child Characteristics, (d) Caregiver Characteristics, and (e) Familial, Social and Economic Characteristics. A four level risk rating of no risk, low risk, moderate risk, or high risk is assigned by assessing past incidents or the current incident leading to In-Home/Family Preservation services. The final section of the MFRA is the Overall Rating of Risk. Workers enter their summary risk ratings for the five preceding risk categories before assigning an overall rating of risk for the family. Workers use the overall family risk rating to inform their case management decisions including case opening.

Workers are trained on the MFRA during pre-service orientation and through ongoing supervision. Currently certification is not required in order to begin using of the MFRA, which raises some concern about the validity and reliability of this assessment. As reported last year, DHR is reviewing its use of the MFRA in assisting workers with the task of predicting risk of maltreatment to the children it serves. While there are no immediate plans due primarily to budget constraints, it is likely that DHR will be making plans to shift away from the MFRA pending further review of the instrument, as resources become available.

Analysis of MFRA data for In-Home/Family Preservation services is therefore descriptive, and breakdowns between DHR In-Home/Family Preservation services and IFPS are available only for FY2010 and FY2011.

MFRA Intake Ratings

At the beginning of an In-Home/Family Preservation service case, workers are required to complete a MFRA rating for the family. Based on data available in MD CHESSIE, it appears that this requirement is not fulfilled in one-fifth of the cases (19% in FY2010, 20% in FY2011). There are a few possible reasons for this persistent lack of data. First, it is possible that the MFRA is completed during the Child Protective Services investigation and then shared with the In-Home services team; second, this shortcoming may reflect a failure to document the results of the MFRA rating in MD CHESSIE, rather than the failure to make a MFRA rating. As part of DHR's new quality assurance program, efforts are continuing to scrutinize the quality of case record documentation. There is slight improvement in the documentation of MFRA data and continuing efforts are underway to achieve a higher rate of MFRA completion in MD CHESSIE. Table 173 (page 170) contains the initial MFRA ratings for all cases, DHR family preservation cases, starting with FY2009, as well as IFPS.

Examining FY2010 and FY2011, the more accurate years for collecting MFRA data in MD CHESSIE, a general pattern emerges for all cases: families rated at moderate risk are the most common group receiving services, 37% for FY2010; 38% for FY2011, followed closely by families with no/low risk; 35% in FY2010; 33% in FY2011; and lastly by families with high risk, 9% for both years.

Comparing DHR family preservation services cases to all cases in FY2010/FY2011, the proportion of no/low risk cases is 2 percentage points higher, up to 2 percentage points lower for moderate risk cases, and 1 percentage point lower for high-risk cases.

Initial Risk based on MFRA Ratings						
In-Home, DHR Family Preservation Services, Interagency Family Preservation Services						
DHR In-Home Services -- All Cases						
		Percent				
Fiscal Year	n	None	Low	Moderate	High	Missing
FY2009	9,109	12%	28%	31%	8%	22%
FY2010	7,951	7%	28%	37%	9%	19%
FY2011	7,569	7%	26%	38%	9%	20%
DHR Family Preservation Cases						
		Percent				
Fiscal Year	n	None	Low	Moderate	High	Missing
FY2009 *	8,541	12%	28%	30%	8%	21%
FY2010	6,919	8%	29%	36%	8%	19%
FY2011	6,608	8%	27%	36%	8%	20%
Interagency Family Preservation Services						
		Percent				
Fiscal Year	n	None	Low	Moderate	High	Missing
FY2009 *	568	5%	22%	41%	7%	24%
FY2010	1,032	3%	20%	42%	13%	21%
FY2011	961	3%	20%	46%	16%	15%
<p><i>* IFPS cases were not separately identified in MD CHESSIE in until halfway through FY2009. The previously reported figures for FY2009, based on LDSS raw data, are: FY2009: Newly Served IFPS-971; Newly-Served At-Risk Children-1,697 FY2010 and FY2011: MD CHESSIE coding for IFPS cases was complete for each fiscal year.</i></p>						

Table 173: Initial Risk based on MFRA Ratings

The opposite trend is noticeable among families receiving IFPS. There is a noticeable upward shift in risk in FY2010/FY2011: no/low risk—23% for both fiscal years, moderate—42% in FY2010, 46% in FY2011, high—13% in FY2010, 16% in FY2011. Based on FY2011 data, the IFPS program serves a substantially higher proportion of families at moderate and high risk of child maltreatment (62%) than the DHR family preservation services (44%). Based on two years of consistent data, families receiving IFPS start services with a higher level of risk for child maltreatment than the DHR family preservation programs.

Another observation that can be gleaned from Table 173 (above) is the high proportion of In-Home/Family Preservation cases that appear to start out at no or low-risk, as follows, using FY2011 data. Table 174 (page 171) isolates these percentages. Overall, one-third of all families starting out with In-Home/Family Preservation Services are at no/low-risk, composed of 7.2% at no risk, and 26.4% of low-risk (for comparison, IFPS have 3.0% at no risk and 19.8% low-risk at the start of those services). There are several factors that lead a family to In-Home Services, including immediate safety issues that are being addressed and resolved, meaning that risk of maltreatment is low and some level of monitoring is appropriate, the return home of a child in Out-of-Home Services and In-Home services are rendered to assure a smooth reunification process, and often there are concrete purchases, including rent, electricity, clothing, automobile repairs, accompanying the start of an In-Home case that helps to avoid the risk of maltreatment (particularly neglect).

Initial Risk based on MFRA Ratings			
In-Home, DHR Family Preservation Services, Interagency Family Preservation Services			
FY2011 Proportion of Families Served starting out with No/Low-Risk Ratings			
	No	Low	No/Low
In-Home	7.2%	26.4%	33.5%
DHR FP	7.8%	27.3%	35.1%
IFPS	3.0%	19.8%	22.8%

Table 174: Initial Risk based on MFRA Ratings

While the number of families and children receiving DHR In-Home/Family Preservation services has been decreasing the last few years, the question of appropriate intake for these services remains a reasonable concern. During difficult budget times, it is critical to ensure that these services are provided to help families at any risk level of maltreatment, but a closer inspection of intake eligibility criteria will help DHR in its mission to serve the most vulnerable children and families.

MFRA Ratings: Comparing the Initial Risk Ratings with Subsequent and Final Risk Ratings

Data are available for comparing MFRA initial ratings with the most recent subsequent rating in new in-home cases during the fiscal year, as well as comparing with final risk ratings among families whose in-home cases closed during the fiscal year. This analysis helps us to answer two related questions: are families improving their risk rating while receiving in-home services, and are families better off (e.g., lowering their risk rating) by the end of In-Home/Family Preservation services? The following tables help to examine the progress experienced by families receiving and completing services.

Comparing Initial and the Most Recent Risk Ratings among New In-Home Cases

One of the goals is to reduce the level of risk for families who receive In-Home/Family Preservation services. Among new In-Home cases in each fiscal year, one method for studying the changes in risk is to compare the initial risk rating for a family to the most recent risk rating documented for that family in order to observe any changes in risk during the course of services. Table 175 (page 172) presents data for families whose services started and MD CHESSIE contains the initial risk rating and at least one subsequent MFRA rating for the family.

Comparison of Initial and Most Recent MFRA Ratings for New Cases Percent of Families Experiencing Worse, Same, or Improved Risk Rating during Services In-Home Services								
	Initial Risk	n	Based on Final Rating, Risk Level was			Cases with Incomplete	Percent	
			Worse	Same	Improved	Data *	Incomplete	
FY2009	High	640	0%	26%	74%	2,451	27%	
	Moderate	2,671	4%	36%	60%			
	Low	2,429	9%	80%	11%			
	None	918	0%	100%	0%			
FY2010	High	650	0%	23%	77%	2,081	26%	
	Moderate	2,706	3%	33%	63%			
	Low	2,110	9%	79%	12%			
	None	404	0%	100%	0%			
FY2011	High	491	0%	29%	71%	2,945	39%	
	Moderate	2,099	3%	37%	60%			
	Low	1,636	6%	82%	12%			
	None	398	0%	100%	0%			

Table 175: Comparison of Initial and Most Recent MFRA Ratings for New Cases

* Data incomplete due to new cases not having subsequent risk rating by end of FY, or missing data

Information about all new In-Home cases is displayed here, including information about cases that have incomplete MFRA data for this analysis. Incomplete data could be related either to the fact that a subsequent risk rating has not yet been recorded for a newly served family, or due to missing data in MD CHESSIE. The following observations pertain to newly served cases where there has been at least one subsequent MFRA rating.

- High-Risk Families: Initially rated at overall high risks, 23% to 29% of families remain at a high risk; and 71% to 77% of families improve (*e.g.*, decrease) their risk;
- Moderate-Risk Families: Initially rated at overall moderate risk, only 3% to 4% of families worsen in their level of risk; 33% to 37% of families remain at a moderate risk; and 60% to 63% improve their risk; and
- Low-Risk Families: Initially rated at overall low risk, 6% to 9% of families worsen in their level of risk; 79% to 82% remain at a low risk; and 11% to 12% improve their risk

Among newly served In-Home families, this descriptive analysis suggests that a far greater proportion of families experience decreased risk of child maltreatment while receiving In-Home/Family Preservation Services rather than the reverse.

Comparing Initial and the Final Risk Ratings among Closed In-Home Cases

The second method for studying the changes in risk is to review In-Home cases closed during each fiscal year and compare the initial risk rating for a family with the final risk rating to observe changes in risk from start to completion of the In-Home service. Table 176 (below) presents an initial to final risk change matrix: along the left side, the breakdown of families based on initial risk ratings, and then graphically illustrates the percentages of families by risk rating at case close. Incomplete risk ratings for closed cases (21% missing for FY2009, 18% missing for FY2010, and 20% missing for FY2011) hampers clarity, however, this analysis provides some insight into the changes occurring among families receiving In-Home/Family Preservation services.

In-Home: All Cases -- FY2009 through FY2011

Matrix indicating Percent of Families at Final Risk Level, Based on Initial Risk Level

The gray-shaded cells in these matrices represent no change in risk rating from intake to final rating, yellow-shaded cells indicate a worsening in maltreatment risk, and the green-shaded cells represent improvement (e.g., a decrease) in risk.

FY2009	Count	Initial Risk	None	Low	Moderate	High
	6,798	Total	1,483	3,663	1,338	314
	1,057	None	87%	10%	3%	0%
	2,430	Low	11%	80%	8%	2%
	2,671	Moderate	9%	51%	36%	4%
	640	High	8%	41%	24%	26%
	1,827	Missing initial, final, or both ratings				
FY2010	Count	Initial Risk	None	Low	Moderate	High
	5,981	Total	965	3,509	1,228	279
	512	None	79%	17%	3%	1%
	2,112	Low	12%	79%	7%	2%
	2,706	Moderate	9%	54%	33%	3%
	651	High	10%	44%	24%	23%
	1,361	Missing initial, final, or both ratings				
FY2011	Count	Initial Risk	None	Low	Moderate	High
	4,692	Total	786	2,706	985	215
	464	None	86%	12%	2%	1%
	1,637	Low	12%	82%	5%	1%
	2,100	Moderate	7%	53%	37%	3%
	491	High	10%	39%	22%	29%
	1,164	Missing initial, final, or both ratings				

Table 176: In-Home: All Cases -- FY2009 through FY2011

The percentages contained in Table 176 (above) correspond to the count of families in each of the Initial Risk categories. For example, during FY2009, 640 families, for whom both an initial and final MFRA rating was recorded in MD CHESSIE, entered In-Home/Family Preservation services with a High level of maltreatment risk. By the time of closing the case, 8% of those families had no risk, 41% had low risk, 24% had moderate risk, and 26% still had a high level of maltreatment risk. This means that nearly three-quarters of the High-risk families for whom both MFRA intake/final risk ratings were recorded were able to decrease their level of risk by case

close.

Among those families who received both an initial and final MFRA risk rating, the overall proportions of families who decreased or held steady in their level of risk ranged from 93% in FY2009 to 95% in FY2011. Although complete data are needed to make firm conclusions, preliminary findings are that most families experience no change or a decrease in risk during the course of In-Home/Family Preservation services. This pattern is persistent from FY2009 through FY2011.

Additional MFRA Risk Rating change matrices are presented as well for FY2010 and FY2011, for the DHR Family Preservation served families, and the IFPS served families (Table 177, page 175). Because the bulk of families are served in DHR Family Preservation, the first part of Table 177 (page 175) resembles the Statewide presentation of all In-Home/Family Preservation services shown in Table 176 (page 173).

Prior to transferring to DHR in FY2008, IFPS had stringent eligibility requirements, focused on families with children at imminent risk of out-of-home placement, and utilized a service model that featured lower caseloads and higher requirements for contact (face-to-face time) with family members. As part of the shift to DHR, eligibility criteria were subject to local determination, along with service model design changes that LDSS offices felt would make the interagency program work best locally. These kinds of changes may have led to a loosening of eligibility criteria as well as variations in service delivery from one jurisdiction to another.

Even so, it is possible that some remnant of the historically intensive focus of IFPS may have persisted after its absorption into the LDSS in-home service array. Based on the information presented, it appears that IFPS families tend to start services with higher levels of risk (Table 177, page 175). It also appears that a larger proportion of IFPS families initially rated high-risk experience decreased risk by case closing, 81% in FY2010, 77% in FY2011, compared to families initially rated high-risk in the DHR Family Preservation population, 76% in FY2010, 69% in FY2011.

Another more pressing matter that MFRA risk ratings reveal is that a sizable proportion of families served throughout DHR's In-Home/Family Preservation program reach the end of services at moderate and high levels of risk of maltreatment: 24% in FY2009 to 26% in FY2011. Among the children who received some type of In-Home/Family Preservation service during FY2009 (19,663), FY2010 (17,376), and FY2011 (16,551), it can be roughly estimated, applying the proportion of families receiving final risk ratings in Table 176 (page 173), that nearly 910 children in FY2009, over 810 children in FY2010, and nearly 760 children in FY2011 ended In-Home/Family Preservation services at a high level of risk. There is concern about these 2,480 children who, based on an extrapolation of MFRA ratings discussed in this section, ended services with their families at high risk of maltreatment during the last 3 years.

It is quite possible that many of these children were removed from their homes if the risk of maltreatment was too high to let them remain safely at home. Frontline Child Protective Services (CPS) workers and In-Home/Family Preservation workers make that kind of decision every day throughout Maryland, both during the time that a child is involved with an In-Home/Family Preservation service, and after the in-home service case has closed. There is also the possibility that a CPS investigation may have been initiated and conducted either during an In-Home/Family Preservation service, or after in-home services have closed.

DHR Family Preservation and IFPS -- FY2010 and FY2011

Matrix indicating Percent of Families at Final Risk Level, Based on Initial Risk Level

DHR Family preservation

The gray-shaded cells in these matrices represent no change in risk rating from intake to final rating, yellow-shaded cells indicate a worsening in maltreatment risk, and the green-shaded cells represent improvement (e.g. a decrease) in risk.

FY2010	Count	Initial Risk	None	Low	Moderate	High
	5,209	Total	884	3,078	1,013	234
	483	None	79%	18%	2%	1%
	1,912	Low	12%	79%	7%	1%
	2,292	Moderate	9%	54%	33%	3%
	522	High	11%	43%	22%	24%
	1,159	Missing initial, final, or both ratings				
FY2011	Count	Initial Risk	None	Low	Moderate	High
	3,998	Total	727	2,331	766	174
	438	None	87%	11%	2%	0%
	1,474	Low	12%	82%	5%	1%
	1,723	Moderate	7%	54%	36%	3%
	363	High	11%	42%	17%	31%
	1,046	Missing initial, final, or both ratings				

Interagency Family preservation Services

FY2010	Count	Initial Risk	None	Low	Moderate	High
	772	Total	81	431	215	45
	29	None	79%	14%	7%	0%
	200	Low	12%	75%	9%	5%
	414	Moderate	7%	52%	38%	3%
	129	High	4%	48%	29%	19%
	202	Missing initial, final, or both ratings				
FY2011	Count	Initial Risk	None	Low	Moderate	High
	694	Total	59	375	219	41
	26	None	77%	19%	0%	4%
	163	Low	8%	88%	4%	1%
	377	Moderate	4%	49%	44%	3%
	128	High	8%	33%	37%	23%
	118	Missing initial, final, or both ratings				

Table 177: DHR Family Preservation/ Interagency Family preservation Services

The next section addresses these issues, and answers the question as to whether children, during In-Home/Family Preservation services, or within one year of closing in-home services, experience either an indicated CPS investigation or a foster care placement.

Analysis of Indicated Findings of Child Maltreatment and Non-Placement Rates

This analysis focuses mainly on the question “Are the children better off?” by measuring the absence of “bad” outcomes: the occurrence of “indicated” CPS findings, and placement in foster care. As such, these indicators are somewhat problematic because, for some children, the risk of

maltreatment is the principle concern: having a CPS investigation and being placed in foster care is often a “good” outcome. As estimated in the previous section, there are 2,480 children ending their In-Home/Family Preservation services at a high risk of maltreatment during FY2009 through FY2011. Accordingly, these indicators are examined to assure that most children served at home do not experience these “bad” outcomes, and to understand the magnitude and trends among those children who do experience these “bad” outcomes.

The goal of In-Home/Family Preservation is to support the family in caring for its children, and to remove the risk of maltreatment, not the children, from their homes. Families generally want to stay together even when challenges and serious deficiencies exist, and the LDSS In-Home staff members strive to assist with reaching that goal. Parents ultimately are responsible for making this work, and when it does not work for a family, CPS investigations may need to be initiated and sometimes children need to be removed from their homes. In the course of providing In-Home/Family Preservation services it is often determined that a CPS investigation needs to be initiated to address safety and risk issues, and/or the need for foster care placement becomes strongly supported and implemented.

An “indicated” CPS finding refers to a decision made by a CPS investigator, upon completion of a child maltreatment investigation, that there is sufficient evidence, which has not been refuted, of child maltreatment. There are two other CPS findings, not reported here, including an “unsubstantiated” finding, meaning that there is not sufficient evidence to support the contention that maltreatment took place, or a “ruled out” finding, meaning that a CPS investigator determined that maltreatment did not take place.

Foster care placement begins with a removal from the home of a child for whom there is a serious safety or maltreatment risk, and the date of removal marks the beginning of the foster care episode. In this analysis, only foster care placement is discussed—other Maryland agencies place or fund the placement of children, however, this year’s report concerns only foster care placement among the children who have participated in DHR’s In-Home/Family Preservation services.

Three years of data has been compiled from MD CHESSIE to answer the following questions: (1) during the provision of In-Home/Family Preservation services, did a CPS investigation resulting in an indicated finding or a foster care placement occur for children receiving service, and (2) during the year following family preservation case closure, did an Indicated CPS investigation or a foster care placement occur among children who had received service? These measures have been constructed as follows:

- During Services – For each fiscal year listed, the children newly served in In-Home cases during that fiscal year are considered, and the observation time period for each child is the start of In-Home services to the first of either:
 - 12 months following the start date of In-Home services, or
 - The In-Home service close date.
- Within 1 Year of Case Close – For each fiscal year listed, the children considered are those who were newly served during the fiscal year and whose In-Home cases closed within 12 months of the start date of In-Home Services. In other words, these are the same children as the “During Services” children whose cases closed during the 12 month observation period.

Table 178 (page 177) displays the counts of cases (families) and children newly served each fiscal year, along with the counts and proportions of newly-served families whose cases closed within one year. It is evident that the majority of cases close within a year of starting. The child

population associated with these cases were observed a year after case closing to determine whether a CPS Indicated investigation or foster care placement occurred. It should be noted that, for the “During Services” observation period, it is necessary for a year to elapse after the reported fiscal year ends. For the “Within 1 Year of Case Closure” observation period, it is necessary for two years to elapse after the reported fiscal year ends. This means that, for this year’s report, complete statistics are available for FY2007 through FY2009, and only “During Service” statistics are available for FY2010.

Breakdowns for DHR Family Preservation Services and IFPS are not available for these years in MD CHESSIE except for FY2010.

In-Home Cases (All)					
	In-Home Newly-Served Case Statistics			In-Home Child Statistics	
Fiscal Year	Newly-Served Cases	Newly-Served & Closed Cases Within 1 Year	% Closed within 1 Year	Newly-Served Children	Newly-Served & Closed Within 1 Year
FY2007 *	5,590	4,295	76.8%	11,552	8,741
FY2008	6,819	6,019	88.3%	14,474	12,641
FY2009	6,303	5,542	87.9%	13,589	11,781
FY2010	5,526	4,763	86.2%	11,934	10,205

Table 178: In-Home Cases (All)

* FY2007 included conversion to MD CHESSIE; hence the incomplete data for that year

Using this construct, Table 179 (page 178) contains information concerning CPS Indicated Investigations and Foster Care placement among children who received In-Home services, both during services and within one year of case closing. Each statistic will be examined in turn.

Indicated CPS Investigations

During service, the four-year rates for this indicator have increased, from 2.0% / 2.1% in FY2007/FY2008, to 3.7% for FY2010. While this means the 96.3% of children receiving In-Home/Family Preservation in FY2010 have not received an Indicated CPS Investigation, it also means that from FY2009 to FY2011, 1,120 children received an indicated CPS finding during services. There does appear to be an upward trend in Indicated CPS Investigations that will be monitored closely as the In-Home/Family Preservation program moves forward.

Indicated CPS Findings and Foster Care Placement Rates								
In-Home, DHR Family Preservation Services, Interagency Family Preservation Services								
In-Home Cases (All)								
Fiscal Year	Indicated CPS Investigation				Out-of-Home Placement			
	During Services		Within 1 Year of Case Close		During Services		Within 1 Year of Case Close	
	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number
FY2007	2.0%	228	3.4%	299	4.6%	536	2.0%	179
FY2008	2.1%	301	2.8%	353	3.1%	445	1.6%	206
FY2009	2.8%	379	3.1%	370	3.8%	512	2.1%	253
FY2010	3.7%	440	NA until FY2013		4.4%	530	NA until FY2013	

Table 179: Indicated CPS Findings and Foster Care Placement Rates

Within one year of case closure, there has been some fluctuation among the children associated with closed cases who have experienced an Indicated CPS Investigation, from 3.4% in FY2007, down to 2.8% in FY2008, and increasing to 3.1% in FY2009. Among these years reported, only FY2010 had complete coding for DHR Family Preservation Services and IFPS, and additional analysis using FY2010 data is constrained further by the unavailability of Indicated CPS Investigations or Out-of-Home Placements following case closure. During services, there is a difference in outcomes between DHR Family Preservation Services and IFPS (Table 180, below), whereby the DHR Family Preservation Services appears to have a higher proportion of Indicated CPS Investigations: 3.9%, compared to 2.7% for IFPS. Additional years' information must be gathered in order to determine the durability of this initial finding.

Indicated CPS Findings and Foster Care Placement Rates								
In-Home, DHR Family Preservation Services, Interagency Family Preservation Services								
DHR Family Preservation Services								
Fiscal Year	Indicated CPS Investigation				Out-of-Home Placement			
	During Services		Within 1 Year of Case Close		During Services		Within 1 Year of Case Close	
	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number
FY2010	3.9%	388	NA until FY2013		4.7%	470	NA until FY2013	
Interagency Family Preservation Services								
Fiscal Year	Indicated CPS Investigation				Out-of-Home Placement			
	During Services		Within 1 Year of Case Close		During Services		Within 1 Year of Case Close	
	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number
FY2010	2.7%	52	NA until FY2013		3.1%	60	NA until FY2013	

Table 180: Indicated CPS Findings and Foster Care Placement Rates

Absence of Foster Care Placement

During service, the three-year foster placement rate for this indicator has been 4.6% or less for FY2007 through FY2010, wherein the proportion of children placed into out-of-home care started out at 4.6% in FY2007, dropped to 3.1% in FY2008, and then climbed almost to the FY2007 rate in FY2010: 4.4%. Although is largely good news in that over 95% of children receiving In-Home/Family Preservation services do not experience a foster care placement, it still means that from FY2009 to FY2011, 1,487 children were removed from their homes during services. As discussed earlier, the LDSS In-Home/Family Preservation workers strive reach the goal of preserving families, but the successful result of that effort hinges on the parents to make that happen for their families. Therefore it is not necessarily a bad outcome for children who truly need to be removed and placed in foster care. At this point, when foster care placement is necessary, the LDSS workers have a much better experience with the child who needs to be placed, and the opportunity of having provided In-Home/Family Preservation services enables the LDSS to make an appropriate foster care placement when it is necessary.

Within one year of case closure, 2.0% of children (179) whose In-Home/Family Preservation services ended in FY2007 experienced a foster care placement. For FY2008, there was a drop in this percentage of children experiencing a foster care placement after In-Home services ended (1.6%), and has climbed back to the FY2007 level in FY2009 (2.1%).

Based on the MFRA risk ratings, it was estimated that nearly 2,500 children receiving In-Home/Family Preservation services over the FY2009 to FY2011 period were rated at a high risk

of child maltreatment by the end of services. Based on the foregoing analysis on Indicated CPS Investigations and Foster Care placement, there are over 1,900 children who receive an indicated CPS finding during In-Home/Family Preservation services or within a year of case close; and over 2,100 children who are removed from their homes and placed in foster care during In-Home/Family Preservation services or within a year of case close, using data from FY2007 through FY2009 (for which there is complete “during services” and “within a year of case close” data). The counts of children receiving indicated CPS findings or being placed into foster care cannot be added up, as it is the case that most children receiving an indicated CPS finding also experience removal/foster care placement. These statistics demonstrate a positive agency response to children whom it knows, whose safety and risk factors, in spite of efforts to preserve families, sometimes must be resolved by removing and placing the children in foster care.

This conclusion is reinforced by a federal measure of safety for child welfare services known as absence of maltreatment recurrence. It is a measure that asks: among children who have received an indicated or unsubstantiated finding of maltreatment in a six month period, what percent of those same children who do *not* have subsequent CPS finding within six months of the first finding? Maryland has consistently met the national standard established for this indicator (greater than 94.6%): 95.8% for FY2010; 96.8% for FY2009; and 95.4% for FY2008. Maryland maintains a tradition of attending to the safety of children in child welfare services, even children who are living at home when challenges to safety have been found to exist.

Summary

DHR In-Home/Family Preservation services are a critical component of meeting the needs of thousands of vulnerable children and their families. In FY2011 more than 16,550 children received In-Home/Family Preservation services while just over 11,340 children received foster care services. DHR’s Place Matters Initiative has had considerable success in its emphasis on family-centered practice and the use of family involvement meetings to find alternatives for children to entering the child welfare system.

Among those served in In-Home/Family Preservation services, based on FY2009 (most recent year for which there is complete data), most children served:

- Do not experience an “indicated” CPS investigation (97.2%) during services, and
- Do not experience a foster care placement (96.2%) during services.

In addition, among those children whose In-Home/Family Preservation services ended, based on FY2009, most children:

- Do not experience an “indicated” CPS investigation (96.9%) within 1 year of case close, and
- Do not experience a foster care placement (97.9%) within 1 year of case close.

Through improved practice changes initiated by the Place Matters Initiative and implementation of Family-Centered Practice, including Family Involvement Meetings at critical trigger points during child welfare service delivery and a focus on family resources who can support relatives going through difficult times, DHR has experienced success in reducing its foster care population, shifting its placement population away from group care and toward family-based care, and reducing overall costs of foster care placements. Data quality in MD CHESSIE continues to

improve substantially, and DHR's child welfare quality assurance program that has been rebuilt over the last year examines both the quality of care as well as the quality of data entry. The focus of the frontline remains to assure that the goals of safety, permanence, and well-being are met for our most vulnerable children, trying first to preserve and support families, and turning to foster care placement only when necessary.

Section IX: Children’s Cabinet Resource Development Initiatives & Conclusion

Resource Development Initiatives

The Children’s Cabinet and GOC are committed to improving outcomes for Maryland’s children and their families. In addition to fulfilling Agency-specific mandates, Maryland’s child-serving Agencies also work collaboratively through the Children’s Cabinet to coordinate policies, evaluate Statewide needs, track progress on outcomes, and oversee funding to local jurisdictions to provide services which directly impact children’s well-being. GOC supports this work by:

- Convening the State Agencies, local partners, and community stakeholders to develop policies and initiatives which reflect the priorities of the Children’s Cabinet and the Governor;
- Managing the Children’s Cabinet Interagency Fund, which provided approximately \$16.6 million in FY2011 to Local Management Boards (LMBs) through Community Partnership Agreements to provide needed services to children and families;
- Collaborating with the LMBs in each Maryland jurisdiction to plan, coordinate, and develop comprehensive systems of care and fund the delivery of integrated services to children and families; and
- Informing the collective and specific work of the Children’s Cabinet by developing and supporting an interagency data management system, collecting and analyzing data, and reporting to the Governor, the Children’s Cabinet, the General Assembly, and other stakeholders on the progress of Maryland’s children.

Until last year, specific strategies of the Children’s Cabinet and the GOC were articulated in two guiding documents: *Maryland’s Three-Year Children’s Plan* (and update) and *Maryland Child and Family Services Interagency Strategic Plan*. Since 2009, the work of the *Maryland Three Year Children’s Plan* has been subsumed in the *Maryland Child and Family Services Interagency Strategy Plan*.

The Maryland Child and Family Services Interagency Strategic Plan

In partnership with communities, families, children, and providers, as well as State and local Agencies, the Children’s Cabinet developed an Interagency Strategic Plan focused on improving the Statewide service delivery system for children and families. Although this plan works towards the improvement of services for children at all levels of need, special consideration is given to at-risk children.

The plan includes recommendations and strategies organized around eight themes:

- Family and Children Partnership
- Interagency Structures
- Workforce Development and Training
- Information Sharing
- Improving Access to Opportunities and Care
- Continuum of Opportunities, Supports, and Care
- Financing
- Education

Implementation of the strategies outlined in the Strategic Plan are ongoing. Information on specific actions can be found in the Implementation Plan available on the GOC website at: <http://goc.maryland.gov/PDF/IMPLEMENTATION%20PLAN%20Rev%20April%202011.pdf>.

I. Care Management Entity (CME)

In the past, the Children’s Cabinet funded CMEs using intensive care coordination with a high-fidelity Wraparound practice model through Local Management Boards (LMBs) in Baltimore City and Montgomery, St. Mary’s, and Wicomico Counties. CMEs manage care for high-utilizing populations of children who typically are involved with multiple systems and are in or at high risk for out-of-home placements. On April 7, 2009, GOC, on behalf of the Children’s Cabinet, issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) to create a CME in each of three regions to serve as an entry point for children, and families with intensive needs so that they can achieve the goals of safety, permanency, and well-being through intensive care coordination using a Wraparound service delivery model and the development of home- and community-based services.

In keeping with the recommendations and strategies that were set forth in the Maryland Child and Family Services Interagency Strategic Plan (2008) (available at <http://www.goc.maryland.gov>), this RFP was the next step in the Children’s Cabinet’s efforts to provide family- and child-driven care that is individualized, effective, responsive, culturally competent, and community-based across all of the child and family-serving systems. Children with complex needs and their families typically are involved with multiple providers and systems, or are at very high risk for such involvement. No one provider or system can respond comprehensively to the constellation of needs of these children and families. As a consequence, children and families end up with multiple plans of care and multiple care coordinators, a situation that is confusing and inefficient for all concerned.

The CME provides a single “locus of accountability” for these children and families and supports the organization, management, delivery and financing of services and resources across multiple providers and systems. High-fidelity Wraparound is the service delivery model used within the CME.

With this RFP, the Children’s Cabinet expanded intensive care management and high fidelity Wraparound from four jurisdictions to Statewide implementation using existing funds. On November 4, 2009, the Board of Public Works approved two contracts to cover the three regions as follows:

- **Baltimore City Region** (Baltimore City);
- **North Western Maryland Region** (Allegany County, Baltimore County, Carroll County, Frederick County, Garrett County, Harford County, Howard County, Montgomery County, Washington County); and
- **South Eastern Maryland Region** (Anne Arundel County, Calvert County, Caroline County, Cecil County, Charles County, Dorchester County, Kent County, Prince George’s County, Queen Anne’s County, St. Mary’s County, Somerset County, Talbot County, Wicomico County, Worcester County).

The CMEs serve various populations of children with intensive needs. By definition, these children have involvement with multiple systems and have complex needs. Therefore, it is understood that there may be some overlap between populations for a particular child or family. However, the populations outlined below are described discretely due to the funding source limitations.

1. **RTC Waiver:** As previously described, Maryland is participating in a federal Center for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) 1915(c) Psychiatric Residential Treatment Facility (PRTF)¹¹ Demonstration Waiver (RTC Waiver) project whose purpose is to provide home- and community-based services for children and children ages 6-20 who, absent the RTC Waiver, would require placement in an RTC. This is a five-year waiver, beginning in Federal FY2008 (October 1, 2007) and ending on September 30, 2012. There are approximately 70 slots available per region. As of November 8, 2011, there are 134 children enrolled in the RTC Waiver with 76 applications in process and 121 children on the waiting list.
2. **MD CARES and Rural CARES - Systems of Care (SOC) Grants:** In September 2008, the U.S. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) awarded Maryland a Children's Mental Health Initiative Cooperative Agreement, commonly referred to as a SOC grant award (see SAMHSA RFA No. SM-08-004). Maryland's project, entitled Maryland Crisis and At Risk for Escalation diversion Services for children (MD CARES), will cement a cross-agency partnership that blends family-driven, evidence-based practices within mental health and child welfare to better serve children and families involved in the State's foster care system.

For MD CARES, service dollars awarded under this cooperative agreement are targeted to the neighborhoods in Baltimore City where the majority of the children and families in foster care reside. For Rural CARES, funding is targeted to the Eastern Shore region encompassing the following nine Counties: Caroline, Cecil, Dorchester, Kent, Queen Anne's, Somerset, Talbot, Wicomico and Worcester. The service focus of these initiatives is the care management and treatment of children in the foster care system, at the point of initial diagnosis of serious emotional disability, in order to prevent out-of-home placement or disruption in current placement when the disability is expected to last in excess of one year.

As previously described, DHR is in the process of rolling-out Statewide application of Maryland's Family-Centered Case Practice Model. The implementation of Family Involvement Team Meetings (FIMs) is a core component of family family-centered practice models. FIMs Team Meetings will be convened by the local departments of social services when:

- a. A child is at imminent risk of removal from home and entry into foster care;
- b. There appears to be a need for change in placement; and/or
- c. There appears to be a need for change in the permanency plan.

These meetings will involve birth parents, extended family members and other participants who play a key role in the child's life. Throughout this process, family members will be engaged from a strength-based perspective.

By referring children to the CME from the FIM Team Meetings, MD CARES and Rural CARES will combine the best practices within both mental health and child welfare through the application of the Wraparound service delivery process for children who have been identified during DHR FIMs Team Meetings to have serious mental health needs and require community support services in order to:

- a. Avoid initial foster home placement;

¹¹ PRTF is the same as an RTC in Maryland.

- b. Stabilize the initial placement to avoid disruption in placement; and/or
- c. Divert from higher level placement or group care.

MD CARES will serve up to 41 children and Rural CARES will serve up to 60 children for an average of 15 months with a projected total of 340 children throughout the project. Through a solid infrastructure and carefully planned Statewide strategies, MD CARES and Rural CARES will also seek to bring the foster care model first developed in Baltimore City for Statewide implementation.

3. **DHR Group Home Diversion:** Directly aligned with the Children’s Cabinet’s SOC efforts is DHR’s Statewide Place Matters Initiative, which promotes safety, family strengthening, permanency and community-based services for children and families in the child welfare system in the least restrictive settings. As part of its Place Matters child welfare reform initiative, services are provided to divert DHR-involved children from group care settings into family care to achieve permanency. There are 25 slots available for this population in each CME region.
4. **DJS Out-of-Home Placement Diversion:** Services are provided to children ages 13-18 who have been committed to the care and custody of DJS and who are:
 - a. Identified by the Court to be at-risk for an out-of-home community residential placement (group home); or
 - b. In pending placement status in a detention facility or in the community; or
 - c. In a detention facility and likely to be identified to be in-need of an out-of-home placement; or
 - d. In an out-of-home placement (in- State or out-of State).

Children are referred to the CME by DJS, with the determination of eligibility based on residency and the criteria outlined above. These children are to be served in the community in a family setting. DJS will not refer children to the CME who are unable to be served in the community for safety reasons or who do not have any viable family living arrangements. Children are served for six to nine months, with a maximum length of service of twelve months under certain circumstances with prior written approval received from DJS prior to the start of the ninth month of service. There are 25 slots available in each CME region for this population.

Place Matters - As one of its administrative functions, the CME will work closely with the staff of DHR and LDSS to support the work of the FIM in order to serve children and children in family settings that are consistent with their permanency plans. Specifically, the CME will have a Community Resource Specialist (two per CME region) available to attend the FIM to identify individualized services and supports in the community that will meet goals within the children’s plan of care in order to achieve his or her permanency plan. If the necessary services are not available in the community, the CME shall work with community providers to create a support to address the need. In addition, the CME shall broker the services and supports and manage the utilization of services and supports to ensure that children are utilizing the appropriate amount and duration of services, are not “stuck” in inappropriate services, and that services/supports are leading to measurable outcomes. The CME will not be responsible for actual payment for the brokered services. The payment function will be with the LDSS.

II. *Single Point of Entry*

GOC serves as a single point of entry (SPE) for prospective providers who wish to establish Residential Child Care Programs (RCCPs), and current providers who wish to expand existing RCCPs. Through this process GOC coordinates the licensing process for RCCPs for Maryland State child-serving agencies.

SB 782 was passed during the 2008 legislative session and changed the way in which proposals can be accepted for RCCPs to be licensed by DHR and DJS (codified as Maryland Annotated Code, Human Services Article, §8-703.1). Effective October 1, 2008, proposals for new programs and expansion of existing programs licensed by those agencies may only be accepted in response to a statement of need. SB 782 does not affect programs licensed by DHMH. The majority of children placed in homes licensed by DHMH are placed by DHR and DJS and it is unlikely that new homes licensed by DHMH would contract with those agencies unless they have issued a statement of need for such homes. As a result, it is anticipated that there will be a significant drop in the number of potential new providers. The last SPE training was held in July 2011.

III. *Evidenced-Based Practices (EBPs)*

Child- and family-serving agencies in Maryland have a demonstrated a strong commitment to creating systems of care to ensure that children and families receive access to services and supports that are home- and community-based, culturally and linguistically competent, individualized, effective, and family-driven and children-guided. This is done by enhancing service delivery systems through a focus on outcomes, fidelity, fiscal impact, and evidence-based practices and promising service delivery frameworks and promoting opportunities for healthy development and learning. Supported by the Children's Cabinet's Child and Family Services Interagency Strategic Plan, the Child and Adolescent Innovations Institute developed the Evidence-Based Practices (EBP) Center (The Center) as an interdisciplinary resource, training, technical assistance and research hub for Maryland's Children's Cabinet. The Center assists the Children's Cabinet in supporting the implementation and outcomes monitoring of EBPs designed to help children and families who face a broad range of problems, and are involved with different agencies across the State. Utilizing implementation science, the Center is tasked with:

- Developing a methodology for new implementation and expansion of EBPs;
- Providing implementation support to local jurisdictions and EBP providers;
- Gathering, monitoring, analyzing, and reporting on EBP fidelity, outcomes, and utilization data;
- Assisting the State in identifying financing strategies to support the implementation of EBPs in Maryland; and
- Serving as a liaison between EBP Purveyors, the State of Maryland, local jurisdictions, and local EBP providers.

The Center also worked with the State to identify and prioritize EBPs for implementation in Maryland. The following EBPs were prioritized for the first wave of implementation:

- Multisystemic Therapy (MST)
- Functional Family Therapy (FFT)
- Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care (MTFC)
- Trauma Focused Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (TF-CBT).

IV. Local Management Boards (LMBs)

The LMBs serve as the coordinator of collaboration for child and family services. They bring together local child-serving agencies, local child providers, clients of services, families, and other community representatives to empower local stakeholders in addressing the needs of and setting priorities for their communities. There is an LMB in each County and in Baltimore City.

A Community Partnership Agreement (CPA) is established after an LMB conducts a community needs assessment, negotiates with the State, and makes a long-term commitment to produce improved outcomes in one or more the State's eight Results areas for child and family well-being. Maryland's eight Results for child well-being reflect the priorities of the Children's Cabinet and the Governor and provide structure to the work of Maryland's 24 LMBs. Funding from the Children's Cabinet Interagency Fund is used by the LMBs to develop and deliver services which address one or more of the eight Result areas as prioritized by the local jurisdiction.

LMBs continue their work in each of Maryland's 24 jurisdictions, engineering changes in their communities that will result in a better quality of life for children and families. To date, LMBs have:

- led the way in returning and diverting children from out-of- State placements;
- created interagency services for children at-risk of out-of-home placements;
- increased linkages between public and private agencies serving children and families; and
- served as the coordinating body for many community level grants and initiatives such as, School-Based Health Centers, C-Safe, Children Strategies Initiative, and Healthy Families.

Conclusion

The Children's Cabinet remains committed to the development of local, integrated systems of care that ensure that children and their families are served in a culturally and linguistically competent manner, that services are community-based and individualized, and that decisions are child-guided and family-driven. In order to achieve these principles, additional resources must be targeted for underserved areas and a renewed focus must be placed on the identification of resources that meet the needs of the families, children, agencies, and community members involved in the care of children.

The data presented in this Report makes it abundantly clear that the majority of resources reside in the central region of the State. A regional approach to resource development that includes partnership with family members and children is the most efficient way to promote the adequate and appropriate delivery of services and supports to children in their communities. The development of new residential resources for children should only occur when there is a clearly identified need for the service in a particular jurisdiction or region.

The State continues to make progress in reducing the number of children in out-of-home placements. Now is the time to focus our creative efforts to ensure that those children who are in out-of-home placements are in facilities that are as much like home as possible, meet their individual needs, and are close to their families and communities of origin.

Appendices

APPENDIX A: PLACEMENT BY JURISDICTION TABLES

DHR: All Placement Categories and Subcategories

Placement Jurisdiction																												
Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	109	1.4%	85	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	13	2
Anne Arundel	153	2.0%	0	76	22	10	0	3	1	1	7	1	1	0	2	1	1	4	7	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	10	2
Baltimore	555	7.3%	1	14	336	75	0	0	7	6	0	3	4	1	36	12	0	7	14	0	2	1	0	3	1	1	11	20
Baltimore City	4190	55.0%	6	101	1020	2322	2	1	16	4	8	6	10	4	85	58	0	15	150	0	9	6	1	15	2	0	83	266
Calvert	76	1.0%	0	3	3	2	47	1	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	2
Caroline	33	0.4%	0	0	3	0	0	12	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	1	0	5	0	0	0
Carroll	38	0.5%	0	0	5	1	0	0	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0
Cecil	117	1.5%	0	2	17	3	0	1	0	78	0	2	2	0	4	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	2
Charles	111	1.5%	1	0	10	2	7	0	0	0	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2
Dorchester	25	0.3%	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	3	0	1	1	1
Frederick	158	2.1%	1	1	6	3	0	2	3	1	0	0	80	0	1	2	0	7	7	0	0	0	0	33	0	0	6	5
Garrett	47	0.6%	2	0	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	2
Harford	255	3.3%	0	1	47	19	1	3	1	15	2	2	1	2	130	5	0	0	1	1	0	4	0	3	2	0	7	8
Howard	65	0.9%	0	3	15	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	1	1	17	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	4
Kent	10	0.1%	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	518	6.8%	0	6	43	12	2	0	6	2	6	0	20	7	3	6	0	310	52	0	2	0	0	13	1	0	13	14
Prince George's	605	7.9%	1	13	43	15	9	1	1	2	19	3	1	0	2	7	0	29	419	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	17	20
Queen Anne's	19	0.2%	0	1	5	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Somerset	49	0.6%	1	0	6	1	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	14	1	2	2
St. Mary's	141	1.9%	0	0	11	5	4	0	0	1	20	0	0	0	3	0	0	4	21	0	0	60	0	0	0	0	6	6
Talbot	36	0.5%	0	0	4	0	0	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	19	0	4	0	0	0
Washington	195	2.6%	1	0	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	159	1	0	3	5
Wicomico	70	0.9%	0	0	4	3	0	2	0	0	0	11	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	1	2	0	0	36	2	3	1	1
Worcester	37	0.5%	0	0	5	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	13	8	2	1
OOS	3	0.0%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	7615	100.0%	99	222	1624	2493	72	36	61	110	129	59	126	53	270	112	11	385	710	18	38	73	21	241	87	12	188	365
% of placements from jurisdiction			78.0%	49.7%	60.5%	55.4%	61.8%	36.4%	63.2%	66.7%	55.0%	56.0%	50.6%	63.8%	51.0%	26.2%	70.0%	59.8%	69.3%	42.1%	36.7%	42.6%	52.8%	81.5%	51.4%	21.6%	0.0%	0.0%
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			1.3%	2.9%	21.3%	32.7%	0.9%	0.5%	0.8%	1.4%	1.7%	0.8%	1.7%	0.7%	3.5%	1.5%	0.1%	5.1%	9.3%	0.2%	0.5%	1.0%	0.3%	3.2%	1.1%	0.2%	2.5%	4.8%

DJS: All Placement Categories and Subcategories

Placement Jurisdiction																												
Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	19	2.0%	12	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	65	6.9%	8	5	8	10	0	0	3	0	0	3	1	8	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	9	0
Baltimore	76	8.0%	9	3	15	5	0	0	10	0	1	8	4	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	8	0
Baltimore City	263	27.8%	15	9	34	22	0	0	18	0	0	13	20	30	2	0	0	18	4	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	64	0
Calvert	9	1.0%	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	7	0.7%	0	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	19	2.0%	7	1	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0
Cecil	13	1.4%	0	0	6	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	31	3.3%	3	1	3	4	0	0	3	0	0	4	1	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	3	0
Dorchester	6	0.6%	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	22	2.3%	1	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	1	0
Garrett	7	0.7%	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	12	1.3%	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Howard	7	0.7%	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Kent	6	0.6%	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	92	9.7%	21	4	8	6	0	0	4	0	0	4	8	7	0	0	0	16	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	11	0
Prince George's	151	15.9%	12	12	14	7	0	0	6	0	1	9	16	16	0	0	0	20	7	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	17	0
Queen Anne's	10	1.1%	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0
Somerset	4	0.4%	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
St. Mary's	19	2.0%	6	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Talbot	6	0.6%	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	36	3.8%	12	0	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	1	0
Wicomico	35	3.7%	2	1	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	1	0	1	0
Worcester	11	1.2%	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
OOS	21	2.2%	3	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	4	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	947	100.0%	119	45	128	85	1	0	48	0	3	50	76	87	2	1	9	79	14	0	0	4	11	58	3	0	124	0
% of placements from jurisdiction			63.2%	7.7%	19.7%	8.4%	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	18.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	17.4%	4.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	22.2%	2.9%	0.0%	19.0%	0.0%
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			12.6%	4.8%	13.5%	9.0%	0.1%	0.0%	5.1%	0.0%	0.3%	5.3%	8.0%	9.2%	0.2%	0.1%	1.0%	8.3%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	1.2%	6.1%	0.3%	0.0%	13.1%	0.0%

DHMH-ADAA: All Placement Categories and Subcategories

Placement Jurisdiction																												
Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	5	2.5%	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	9	4.4%	1	2	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	21	10.3%	4	4	4	1	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Baltimore City	33	16.2%	3	2	8	9	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Calvert	6	2.9%	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	5	2.5%	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	11	5.4%	5	0	2	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	7	3.4%	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	5	2.5%	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	3	1.5%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	6	2.9%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	9	4.4%	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Howard	4	2.0%	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	1	0.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	17	8.3%	3	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
Prince George's	12	5.9%	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queen Anne's	3	1.5%	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	1	0.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	4	2.0%	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Talbot	3	1.5%	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Washington	2	1.0%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	5	2.5%	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Worcester	3	1.5%	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	29	14.2%	2	1	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	204	100.0%	44	18	50	10	1	0	25	0	0	5	3	0	12	2	4	3	5	0	0	3	0	19	0	0	0	0
% of placements from jurisdiction			80.0%	22.2%	19.0%	27.3%	0.0%	0.0%	36.4%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	0.0%	11.1%	50.0%	0.0%	17.6%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			21.6%	8.8%	24.5%	4.9%	0.5%	0.0%	12.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	1.5%	0.0%	5.9%	1.0%	2.0%	1.5%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	9.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

DHMH-DDA: All Placement Categories and Subcategories

Placement Jurisdiction

Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	2	1.9%	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	6	5.6%	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	20	18.7%	0	0	17	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore City	7	6.5%	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calvert	1	0.9%	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	8	7.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	1	0.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	3	2.8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	1	0.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	1	0.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	4	3.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	1	0.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	33	30.8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prince George's	9	8.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queen Anne's	1	0.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	2	1.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	1	0.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	3	2.8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	3	2.8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	107	100.0%	2	5	20	8	1	0	8	1	3	0	1	0	1	4	1	33	9	1	2	1	0	3	3	0	0	0
% of placements from jurisdiction			100.0%	83.3%	85.0%	71.4%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			1.9%	4.7%	18.7%	7.5%	0.9%	0.0%	7.5%	0.9%	2.8%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.9%	3.7%	0.9%	30.8%	8.4%	0.9%	1.9%	0.9%	0.0%	2.8%	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

DHMH-MHA: All Placement Categories and Subcategories

Placement Jurisdiction

Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	6	1.4%	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	27	6.2%	0	10	11	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	105	24.2%	0	0	19	80	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore City	95	21.9%	0	2	43	41	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Calvert	2	0.5%	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	2	0.5%	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	4	0.9%	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	9	2.1%	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	8	1.8%	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	18	4.1%	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	37	8.5%	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	2	0.5%	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	11	2.5%	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	3	0.7%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	1	0.2%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	48	11.1%	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prince George's	19	4.4%	0	3	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queen Anne's	1	0.2%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	1	0.2%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	7	1.6%	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	3	0.7%	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	10	2.3%	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	8	1.8%	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Worcester	3	0.7%	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	4	0.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	434	100.0%	0	22	106	172	0	0	0	0	0	37	48	0	0	0	0	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0
% of placements from jurisdiction			0.0%	37.0%	18.1%	43.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	72.2%	78.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	68.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	75.0%	0.0%
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			0.0%	5.1%	24.4%	39.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.5%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%

MSDE: All Placement Categories and Subcategories

Placement Jurisdiction																													
Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown	
Allegany	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Anne Arundel	6	9.1%	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Baltimore	9	13.6%	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
Baltimore City	7	10.6%	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
Calvert	1	1.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	1	1.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	1	1.5%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	1	1.5%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	4	6.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	1	1.5%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	2	3.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	2	3.0%	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	19	28.8%	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0
Prince George's	12	18.2%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	66	100.0%	0	0	1	1	0	16	0	8	0	0	1	0	0	7	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	0
% of placements from jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	31.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	1.5%	0.0%	24.2%	0.0%	12.1%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	10.6%	0.0%	15.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%

Community Based Residential Placements: Independent Living Programs

Placement Jurisdiction																												
Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	7	3.1%	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	14	6.2%	0	1	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Baltimore City	136	60.4%	0	0	37	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Calvert	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Cecil	1	0.4%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Charles	3	1.3%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
Dorchester	1	0.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Frederick	2	0.9%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Harford	4	1.8%	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Howard	6	2.7%	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Montgomery	20	8.9%	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Prince George's	26	11.6%	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Queen Anne's	1	0.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Somerset	1	0.4%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
St. Mary's	1	0.4%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Washington	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Wicomico	1	0.4%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Worcester	1	0.4%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Grand Total	225	100.0%	0	4	55	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	28	25	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	
% of placements from jurisdiction			0.0%	42.9%	50.0%	68.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	85.0%	69.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			0.0%	1.8%	24.4%	48.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	12.4%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	

Community Based Residential Placements: Residential Child Care Programs "Group Homes"

Placement Jurisdiction

Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	11	1.0%	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0
Anne Arundel	43	3.9%	0	10	14	1	0	1	0	1	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	0
Baltimore	110	9.9%	2	3	57	10	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	1	6	5	0	4	10	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	4	0
Baltimore City	425	38.2%	0	13	122	191	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	0	19	42	0	0	0	0	16	1	0	11	0
Calvert	9	0.8%	0	0	3	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Caroline	5	0.4%	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	15	1.3%	1	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0
Cecil	17	1.5%	0	0	7	2	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Charles	20	1.8%	0	1	4	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Dorchester	5	0.4%	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Frederick	37	3.3%	0	1	2	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	4	0
Garrett	10	0.9%	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0
Harford	52	4.7%	0	1	23	2	0	3	0	4	2	0	0	2	6	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	0
Howard	15	1.3%	0	0	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0
Kent	3	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	89	8.0%	0	3	12	3	0	0	0	2	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	49	6	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	4	0
Prince George's	147	13.2%	0	11	20	5	1	1	0	2	2	0	7	0	2	0	0	17	62	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	4	0
Queen Anne's	7	0.6%	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Somerset	6	0.5%	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	17	1.5%	0	0	5	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Talbot	1	0.1%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	41	3.7%	3	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	27	1	0	0	0
Wicomico	19	1.7%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	0	2	0
Worcester	5	0.4%	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	5	0.4%	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	1114	100.0%	12	45	300	229	6	9	1	17	14	0	13	9	22	14	9	110	140	1	1	0	0	108	10	0	44	0
% of placements from jurisdiction			45.5%	23.3%	51.8%	44.9%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	17.6%	5.0%	0.0%	2.7%	30.0%	11.5%	6.7%	66.7%	55.1%	42.2%	14.3%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	65.9%	42.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			1.1%	4.0%	26.9%	20.6%	0.5%	0.8%	0.1%	1.5%	1.3%	0.0%	1.2%	0.8%	2.0%	1.3%	0.8%	9.9%	12.6%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	9.7%	0.9%	0.0%	3.9%	0.0%

Community Based Residential Placements: Community-Supported Living Arrangements (CSLA)

Placement Jurisdiction																												
Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	2	2.1%	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	6	6.3%	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	15	15.6%	0	0	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore City	6	6.3%	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calvert	1	1.0%	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	8	8.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	1	1.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	3	3.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	1	1.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	1	1.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	4	4.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	1	1.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	32	33.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prince George's	8	8.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	1	1.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	1	1.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	3	3.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	2	2.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	96	100.0%	2	5	15	7	1	0	8	1	3	0	1	0	1	4	1	32	8	0	1	1	0	3	2	0	0	0
% of placements from jurisdiction			100.0%	83.3%	80.0%	66.7%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			2.1%	5.2%	15.6%	7.3%	1.0%	0.0%	8.3%	1.0%	3.1%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	1.0%	4.2%	1.0%	33.3%	8.3%	0.0%	1.0%	1.0%	0.0%	3.1%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Community Based Residential Placements: Composite Community Based

		Placement Jurisdiction																										
Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore City	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calvert	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prince George's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of placements from jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Community Based Residential Placements: Living Arrangements Community Based

Placement Jurisdiction																													
Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown	
Allegany	1	1.3%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Anne Arundel	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	6	7.6%	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Baltimore City	45	57.0%	4	1	2	9	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	
Calvert	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Cecil	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Charles	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Frederick	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Garrett	1	1.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Harford	1	1.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Howard	2	2.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Montgomery	13	16.5%	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	
Prince George's	5	6.3%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Somerset	1	1.3%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
St. Mary's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Washington	2	2.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Wicomico	1	1.3%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Worcester	1	1.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Grand Total	79	100.0%	7	1	6	12	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	10	0	13	0	0	1	3	1	1	20	
% of placements from jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	7.7%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			8.9%	1.3%	7.6%	15.2%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	1.3%	12.7%	0.0%	16.5%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	3.8%	1.3%	1.3%	25.3%	

Family Home Settings: Adoptive Care

Placement Jurisdiction

Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Placement Jurisdiction																										
			Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown	
Allegany	9	15.0%	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0
Anne Arundel	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	1	1.7%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore City	11	18.3%	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	
Calvert	4	6.7%	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Carroll	2	3.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Cecil	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Charles	4	6.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Frederick	2	3.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Garrett	3	5.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Harford	4	6.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	
Howard	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Montgomery	2	3.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Prince George's	1	1.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Queen Anne's	2	3.3%	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
St. Mary's	2	3.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Washington	10	16.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	
Wicomico	3	5.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Grand Total	60	100.0%	5	0	4	8	3	0	2	0	4	3	3	3	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	3	0	10	0	0	9	0	
% of placements from			55.6%	0.0%	100.0%	72.7%	75.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			8.3%	0.0%	6.7%	13.3%	5.0%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	6.7%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	5.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	15.0%	0.0%	

Family Home Settings: Foster Care

Placement Jurisdiction																												
Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	50	3.7%	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Anne Arundel	38	2.8%	0	31	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0
Baltimore	94	6.9%	0	0	73	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2
Baltimore City	495	36.3%	0	9	117	326	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	6	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	4	
Calvert	21	1.5%	0	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	16	1.2%	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	
Carroll	15	1.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	51	3.7%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	42	3.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Dorchester	4	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	47	3.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	1	0
Garrett	9	0.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	72	5.3%	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	10	0.7%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	2	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	126	9.2%	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	6	1	0	3	0	97	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	
Prince George's	95	7.0%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0
Queen Anne's	8	0.6%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	11	0.8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0
St. Mary's	41	3.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	0	0	0	0	4	0
Talbot	12	0.9%	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	78	5.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	0	0	1	0
Wicomico	16	1.2%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	12	0	1	0
Worcester	12	0.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	2	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	1365	100.0%	48	40	201	329	21	14	21	49	46	4	50	11	83	28	2	101	91	13	8	33	10	78	20	5	53	6
% of placements from jurisdiction			96.0%	81.6%	77.7%	65.9%	100.0%	68.8%	100.0%	96.1%	97.6%	100.0%	87.2%	100.0%	86.1%	80.0%	100.0%	77.0%	81.1%	87.5%	63.6%	80.5%	83.3%	94.9%	75.0%	41.7%	0.0%	0.0%
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			3.5%	2.9%	14.7%	24.1%	1.5%	1.0%	1.5%	3.6%	3.4%	0.3%	3.7%	0.8%	6.1%	2.1%	0.1%	7.4%	6.7%	1.0%	0.6%	2.4%	0.7%	5.7%	1.5%	0.4%	3.9%	0.4%

Family Home Settings: Relative Care

Placement Jurisdiction

Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	29	2.2%	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1
Anne Arundel	14	1.1%	0	12	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	51	3.9%	0	1	41	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Baltimore City	890	67.6%	0	22	128	647	0	1	0	0	2	2	1	0	10	8	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	16	46
Calvert	15	1.1%	0	2	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Caroline	2	0.2%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	4	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	9	0.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	13	1.0%	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Dorchester	1	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	19	1.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	14	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Garrett	8	0.6%	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	34	2.6%	0	0	3	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
Howard	2	0.2%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	1	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	104	7.9%	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	4	4	0	0	0	73	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	3
Prince George's	67	5.1%	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	56	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	3	0.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	26	2.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	4
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	20	1.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	0	0	0	1
Wicomico	1	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Worcester	1	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
OOS	2	0.2%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	1316	100.0%	24	38	178	659	14	2	6	10	9	3	19	10	35	11	1	80	80	1	3	21	1	24	0	0	26	61
% of placements from jurisdiction			79.3%	85.7%	80.4%	72.7%	60.0%	50.0%	100.0%	100.0%	23.1%	100.0%	73.7%	75.0%	61.8%	50.0%	100.0%	70.2%	83.6%	0.0%	100.0%	76.9%	0.0%	95.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			1.8%	2.9%	13.5%	50.1%	1.1%	0.2%	0.5%	0.8%	0.7%	0.2%	1.4%	0.8%	2.7%	0.8%	0.1%	6.1%	6.1%	0.1%	0.2%	1.6%	0.1%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	4.6%

Family Home Settings: Restricted Relative Care

Placement Jurisdiction																												
Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	1	0.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Anne Arundel	4	0.6%	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Baltimore	30	4.7%	0	1	19	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore City	508	80.1%	0	17	90	341	0	0	3	2	0	1	0	0	7	6	0	0	4	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	34	1
Calvert	6	0.9%	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	1	0.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	4	0.6%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Charles	2	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	10	1.6%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
Garrett	2	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Harford	10	1.6%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	1	0.2%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	26	4.1%	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	16	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0
Prince George's	13	2.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	4	0.6%	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	9	1.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	2	0
Wicomico	2	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
Worcester	1	0.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	634	100.0%	0	20	112	346	9	0	4	4	2	1	9	0	18	7	0	18	20	0	0	6	0	9	2	1	44	2
% of placements from jurisdiction			0.0%	25.0%	63.3%	67.1%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	60.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	61.5%	92.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	55.6%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			0.0%	3.2%	17.7%	54.6%	1.4%	0.0%	0.6%	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%	1.4%	0.0%	2.8%	1.1%	0.0%	2.8%	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	1.4%	0.3%	0.2%	6.9%	0.3%

Family Home Settings: Treatment Foster Care (TFC)

Placement Jurisdiction																												
Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	7	0.3%	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	36	1.7%	0	11	7	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0
Baltimore	184	8.8%	1	5	112	35	0	0	3	2	1	1	1	0	12	2	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	2	0
Baltimore City	1200	57.1%	4	34	459	496	2	0	11	2	6	2	0	0	46	30	0	9	86	0	1	2	1	3	1	0	2	3
Calvert	16	0.8%	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Caroline	13	0.6%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0
Carroll	3	0.1%	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	20	1.0%	0	2	3	2	0	1	0	7	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Charles	27	1.3%	1	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	6	0.3%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
Frederick	23	1.1%	1	1	5	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0
Garrett	6	0.3%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	46	2.2%	0	0	8	6	0	0	1	9	0	0	0	0	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	21	1.0%	0	1	6	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Kent	1	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	105	5.0%	0	3	17	8	1	0	1	0	3	0	3	1	3	2	0	41	14	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	3	0
Prince George's	229	10.9%	2	7	12	6	6	0	1	0	14	0	0	0	0	4	0	8	167	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Queen Anne's	6	0.3%	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0
Somerset	21	1.0%	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	11	1	0	0
St. Mary's	37	1.8%	0	0	2	3	1	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	11	0.5%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	4	0	0	0
Washington	26	1.2%	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	32	1.5%	0	0	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	6	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	11	2	0	0
Worcester	20	1.0%	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	8	1	0	0
OOS	4	0.2%	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	2100	100.0%	17	67	642	570	15	9	21	20	50	28	5	12	90	44	3	63	306	3	9	5	13	46	45	5	9	3
% of placements from jurisdiction			57.1%	30.6%	60.9%	41.3%	12.5%	0.0%	33.3%	35.0%	29.6%	33.3%	0.0%	83.3%	43.5%	14.3%	100.0%	39.0%	72.9%	0.0%	19.0%	2.7%	18.2%	65.4%	34.4%	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			0.8%	3.2%	30.6%	27.1%	0.7%	0.4%	1.0%	1.0%	2.4%	1.3%	0.2%	0.6%	4.3%	2.1%	0.1%	3.0%	14.6%	0.1%	0.4%	0.2%	0.6%	2.2%	2.1%	0.2%	0.4%	0.1%

Family Home Settings: Living Arrangement Family Home

Placement Jurisdiction

Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	6	1.6%	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	5	1.4%	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Baltimore	32	8.8%	0	1	19	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Baltimore City	167	45.8%	0	2	20	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Calvert	7	1.9%	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	1	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	12	3.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Charles	1	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	5	1.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Frederick	17	4.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Garrett	4	1.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Harford	20	5.5%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3
Howard	3	0.8%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	1	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	24	6.6%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Prince George's	24	6.6%	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Queen Anne's	1	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	4	1.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	5	1.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	1
Talbot	10	2.7%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	14	3.8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	1
Wicomico	2	0.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	365	100.0%	6	9	39	117	5	1	2	10	6	5	15	3	18	1	2	22	20	1	4	4	8	13	4	0	0	50
% of placements from jurisdiction			100.0%	60.0%	59.4%	65.3%	71.4%	0.0%	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%	80.0%	70.6%	75.0%	70.0%	33.3%	100.0%	79.2%	58.3%	100.0%	100.0%	80.0%	80.0%	92.9%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			1.6%	2.5%	10.7%	32.1%	1.4%	0.3%	0.5%	2.7%	1.6%	1.4%	4.1%	0.8%	4.9%	0.3%	0.5%	6.0%	5.5%	0.3%	1.1%	1.1%	2.2%	3.6%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	13.7%

Hospitalizations: Psychiatric Hospitalizations

Placement Jurisdiction

Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	1	3.7%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	1	3.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	3	11.1%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Baltimore City	6	22.2%	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Calvert	1	3.7%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	2	7.4%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	1	3.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	1	3.7%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	1	3.7%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	1	3.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Kent	1	3.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	1	3.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prince George's	2	7.4%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queen Anne's	1	3.7%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	2	7.4%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	1	3.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Worcester	1	3.7%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	27	100.0%	1	0	11	1	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	4
% of placements from jurisdiction			100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			3.7%	0.0%	40.7%	3.7%	0.0%	0.0%	7.4%	0.0%	0.0%	7.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%	3.7%	3.7%	3.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%	3.7%	0.0%	0.0%	14.8%

Hospitalizations: General Hospitalizations

Placement Jurisdiction

Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	1	6.3%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	1	6.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Baltimore City	1	6.3%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calvert	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	1	6.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Dorchester	2	12.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Frederick	1	6.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	1	6.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Howard	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	1	6.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prince George's	2	12.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	1	6.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
St. Mary's	1	6.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	1	6.3%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	1	6.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Worcester	1	6.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	16	100.0%	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	4
% of placements from jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	6.3%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	6.3%	25.0%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%

Non-Community Based Residential Placement: Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program (DETP)

Placement Jurisdiction

Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown		
Allegany	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Anne Arundel	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Baltimore	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Baltimore City	5	33.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0		
Calvert	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Cecil	3	20.0%	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Charles	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Frederick	2	13.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Harford	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Howard	1	6.7%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Kent	1	6.7%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Montgomery	1	6.7%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Prince George's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	1	6.7%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Talbot	1	6.7%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Washington	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Wicomico	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Grand Total	15	100.0%	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0		
% of placements from jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			0.0%	0.0%	53.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	

Non-Community Based Residential Placement: Detention Facilities

Placement Jurisdiction																													
Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown	
Allegany	5	3.0%	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	13	7.8%	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	12	7.2%	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Baltimore City	42	25.3%	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Calvert	1	0.6%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Carroll	3	1.8%	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Cecil	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Charles	5	3.0%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Dorchester	1	0.6%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Frederick	1	0.6%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Garrett	3	1.8%	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Harford	3	1.8%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Howard	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Montgomery	33	19.9%	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Prince George's	22	13.3%	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
St. Mary's	6	3.6%	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Talbot	1	0.6%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Washington	8	4.8%	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Wicomico	5	3.0%	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
OOS	2	1.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Grand Total	166	100.0%	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
% of placements from jurisdiction			60.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			44.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	27.1%	28.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	

Non-Community Based Residential Placement: Non-Secure Residential Placements

Placement Jurisdiction																												
Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	4	11.4%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
Baltimore	3	8.6%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Baltimore City	10	28.6%	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0
Calvert	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	1	2.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	5	14.3%	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
Prince George's	8	22.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	1	2.9%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	1	2.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Wicomico	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	2	5.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	35	100.0%	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	0
% of placements from jurisdiction			0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	80.0%	0.0%

Non-Community Based Residential Placement: Residential Educational Facilities

Placement Jurisdiction

Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	6	9.1%	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Baltimore	9	13.6%	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
Baltimore City	7	10.6%	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
Calvert	1	1.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	1	1.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	1	1.5%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	1	1.5%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	4	6.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	1	1.5%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	2	3.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	2	3.0%	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	19	28.8%	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0
Prince George's	12	18.2%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	66	100.0%	0	0	1	1	0	16	0	8	0	0	1	0	0	7	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	0
% of placements from jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	31.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	1.5%	0.0%	24.2%	0.0%	12.1%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	10.6%	0.0%	15.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%

Non-Community Based Residential Placement: Residential Treatment Center (RTC)

Placement Jurisdiction

Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown	
Allegany	11	1.4%	0	0	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	53	6.6%	0	12	16	15	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	150	18.8%	0	2	39	91	0	0	1	0	0	7	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	
Baltimore City	175	21.9%	0	5	90	53	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	
Calvert	5	0.6%	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	4	0.5%	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	11	1.4%	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Cecil	21	2.6%	0	0	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	18	2.3%	0	0	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	20	2.5%	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	48	6.0%	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Garrett	8	1.0%	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	23	2.9%	0	0	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Howard	8	1.0%	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Kent	4	0.5%	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	82	10.3%	0	1	16	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	
Prince George's	67	8.4%	0	7	25	6	0	0	0	0	0	16	3	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	
Queen Anne's	3	0.4%	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	4	0.5%	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	18	2.3%	0	0	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	6	0.8%	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	25	3.1%	0	0	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	23	2.9%	0	2	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Worcester	3	0.4%	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	8	1.0%	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Grand Total	798	100.0%	0	41	266	240	0	0	1	0	0	69	78	0	0	0	0	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	0	
% of placements from jurisdiction			0.0%	22.6%	26.0%	30.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	70.0%	68.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	51.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	37.5%	0.0%	
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			0.0%	5.1%	33.3%	30.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	8.6%	9.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	

Non-Community Based Residential Placement:ASAM

Placement Jurisdiction																												
Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	7	1.6%	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	25	5.7%	1	2	5	3	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0
Baltimore	47	10.7%	6	4	4	1	0	0	14	0	0	6	1	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	4	0
Baltimore City	131	29.9%	5	2	8	19	0	0	27	0	0	8	0	17	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	43	0
Calvert	7	1.6%	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	5	1.1%	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	17	3.9%	9	0	2	0	0	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	8	1.8%	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	14	3.2%	3	1	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0
Dorchester	5	1.1%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	9	2.1%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	11	2.5%	0	0	3	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Howard	6	1.4%	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Kent	2	0.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	31	7.1%	3	0	3	2	0	0	5	0	0	4	1	2	2	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	0
Prince George's	41	9.4%	6	2	6	3	0	0	6	0	0	2	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0
Queen Anne's	5	1.1%	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	1	0.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	9	2.1%	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0
Talbot	5	1.1%	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Washington	3	0.7%	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	8	1.8%	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Worcester	7	1.6%	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	34	7.8%	3	1	18	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	438	100.0%	67	18	50	31	1	0	72	0	0	32	12	39	12	2	4	3	5	0	0	3	0	19	0	0	68	0
% of placements from jurisdiction			85.7%	8.0%	8.5%	14.5%	0.0%	0.0%	29.4%	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%	55.6%	0.0%	9.1%	33.3%	0.0%	9.7%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%	0.0%
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			15.3%	4.1%	11.4%	7.1%	0.2%	0.0%	16.4%	0.0%	0.0%	7.3%	2.7%	8.9%	2.7%	0.5%	0.9%	0.7%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%	15.5%	0.0%

Non-Community Based (NCB) Residential Placement: Living Arrangments_NCB

Placement Jurisdiction

Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	5	4.1%	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	7	5.7%	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Baltimore City	85	69.7%	0	5	14	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	6	0	0	0	13
Calvert	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	3	2.5%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	2	1.6%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	1	0.8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	1	0.8%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	1	0.8%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prince George's	12	9.8%	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	1	0.8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	2	1.6%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	1	0.8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Worcester	1	0.8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	122	100.0%	0	9	21	38	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	5	0	0	0	2	12	0	0	2	0	6	2	0	0	18
% of placements from jurisdiction			0.0%	60.0%	28.6%	41.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			0.0%	7.4%	17.2%	31.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	2.5%	2.5%	4.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	9.8%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	4.9%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	14.8%

Unknown Placements Category

Placement Jurisdiction

Home Jurisdiction	# of jurisdiction placements	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	1	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Anne Arundel	5	1.5%	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Baltimore	17	5.1%	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	8
Baltimore City	250	74.4%	1	2	14	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	157
Calvert	1	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	1	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	4	1.2%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	5	1.5%	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Howard	2	0.6%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Kent	2	0.6%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	12	3.6%	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5
Prince George's	27	8.0%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	12
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	3	0.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
St. Mary's	1	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	2	0.6%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Wicomico	3	0.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	336	100.0%	1	8	19	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	3	2	5	15	0	0	1	0	3	3	0	1	196
% of placements from jurisdiction			0.0%	80.0%	11.8%	26.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	37.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% placements statewide in all jurisdictions (total)			0.3%	2.4%	5.7%	21.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.3%	1.5%	0.9%	0.6%	1.5%	4.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.9%	0.9%	0.0%	0.3%	58.3%

Appendix B: FY 2011 In-State Placements Capacity & Utilization by Placement Category & Agency

FY 2011 Capacity Utilization – In-State Placements

One-Day Census

This one-day census is a summary of participating providers in relation to placements on January 31, 2011 as reported by the child-serving agencies excluding MSDE. The list is separated into the five macro-placement categories including the unknown category and further sorted by the sub-category and reporting agency.

Community-Based Residential Placement

Sub-Category	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reported Agency
	Community-Based Residential Placement	Public			0	0	0	0		78	DHR
CSLA	Abilities Network	Abilities Network	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Baltimore	1	DDA
CSLA	Alliance	Alliance	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Baltimore	1	DDA
CSLA	Arc Of Carroll County Inc	Arc Of Carroll County Inc	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Carroll	1	DDA
CSLA	Arc Of Carroll County Inc	Arc Of Carroll County Inc	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Carroll	1	DDA
CSLA	Arc Of Carroll County Inc	Arc Of Carroll County Inc	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Carroll	1	DDA
CSLA	Arc Of Montgomery County Inc	Arc Of Montgomery County Inc	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DDA
CSLA	Arc Of Montgomery County Inc	Arc Of Montgomery County Inc	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DDA
CSLA	Arc Of Montgomery County Inc	Arc Of Montgomery County Inc	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DDA
CSLA	Arc Of Montgomery County Inc	Arc Of Montgomery County Inc	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DDA

CSLA	Arc Of Montgomery County Inc	Arc Of Montgomery County Inc	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DDA
CSLA	Arc Of Montgomery County Inc	Arc Of Montgomery County Inc	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Montgomery	2	DDA
CSLA	Arc Of Montgomery County Inc	Arc Of Montgomery County Inc	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DDA
CSLA	Arc Of Montgomery County Inc	Arc Of Montgomery County Inc	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Montgomery	2	DDA
CSLA	Arc Of Montgomery County Inc	Arc Of Montgomery County Inc	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DDA
CSLA	Arc Of Northern Cheaspeake	Arc Of Northern Cheaspeake	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Harford	1	DDA
CSLA	Arc Of Northern Cheaspeake	Arc Of Northern Cheaspeake	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Harford	1	DDA
CSLA	Arc Of Northern Cheaspeake	Arc Of Northern Cheaspeake	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Harford	1	DDA
CSLA	Arc Of Prince Georges Co Inc	Arc Of Prince Georges Co Inc	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Prince George's	2	DDA
CSLA	Arc Of Southern Maryland Inc	Arc Of Southern Maryland Inc	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Calvert	1	DDA
CSLA	Arc/Washington Co.	Arc/Washington Co.	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Washington	2	DDA
CSLA	Arc/Washington Co.	Arc/Washington Co.	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Washington	1	DDA
CSLA	Arc/Washington Co.	Arc/Washington Co.	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Washington	1	DDA
CSLA	Arc/Washington Co.	Arc/Washington Co.	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Washington	1	DDA

CSLA	Bay Shore Services, Inc.	Bay Shore Services, Inc.	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Wicomico	1	DDA
CSLA	Bello Machre	Bello Machre	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Anne Arundel	1	DDA
CSLA	Bello Machre	Bello Machre	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Anne Arundel	1	DDA
CSLA	Center For Life Enrichment	Center For Life Enrichment	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	St. Mary's	1	DDA
CSLA	Change, Inc.	Change, Inc.	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Carroll	1	DDA
CSLA	Change, Inc.	Change, Inc.	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Carroll	1	DDA
CSLA	Change, Inc.	Change, Inc.	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Carroll	1	DDA
CSLA	Community Living Inc	Community Living Inc	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Frederick	1	DDA
CSLA	Community Support Services	Community Support Services	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DDA
CSLA	Community Support Services	Community Support Services	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DDA
CSLA	Community Support Services	Community Support Services	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DDA
CSLA	Community Support Services	Community Support Services	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DDA
CSLA	Community Support Services	Community Support Services	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DDA
CSLA	Community Support Services	Community Support Services	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DDA
CSLA	Community Support Services	Community Support Services	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DDA

CSLA	Compass, Inc.	Compass, Inc.	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DDA
CSLA	Compass, Inc.	Compass, Inc.	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DDA
CSLA	Dove Pointe Residential Svc	Dove Pointe Residential Svc	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Wicomico	1	DDA
CSLA	Emerge	Emerge	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Howard	1	DDA
CSLA	Howard County Arc	Howard County Arc	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Howard	1	DDA
CSLA	Humanim	Humanim	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Howard	1	DDA
CSLA	Humanim	Humanim	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Howard	1	DDA
CSLA	Humanim	Humanim	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Howard	1	DDA
CSLA	Humanim	Humanim	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Howard	1	DDA
CSLA	Jewish Community Services, Inc.	Jewish Community Services, Inc.	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Baltimore City	1	DDA
CSLA	Jewish Community Services, Inc.	Jewish Community Services, Inc.	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Baltimore City	1	DDA
CSLA	Jewish Social Service Agency	Jewish Social Service Agency	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DDA
CSLA	Jewish Social Service Agency	Jewish Social Service Agency	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DDA
CSLA	Living Hope, Inc.	Living Hope, Inc.	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Prince George's	1	DDA
CSLA	Lt Joseph P Kennedy Instit	Lt Joseph P Kennedy Instit	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Non-MD Resident	1	DDA
CSLA	Lt Joseph P Kennedy Instit	Lt Joseph P Kennedy Instit	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Non-MD Resident	2	DDA
CSLA	Lt Joseph P Kennedy Instit	Lt Joseph P Kennedy Instit	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Non-MD Resident	1	DDA
CSLA	Lt Joseph P Kennedy Instit	Lt Joseph P Kennedy Instit	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Non-MD Resident	1	DDA
CSLA	Lt Joseph P Kennedy Instit	Lt Joseph P Kennedy Instit	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Non-MD Resident	1	DDA

CSLA	Lt Joseph P Kennedy Instit	Lt Joseph P Kennedy Instit	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Non-MD Resident	1	DDA
CSLA	Lt Joseph P Kennedy Instit	Lt Joseph P Kennedy Instit	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Non-MD Resident	1	DDA
CSLA	Lt Joseph P Kennedy Instit	Lt Joseph P Kennedy Instit	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Non-MD Resident	2	DDA
CSLA	Lt Joseph P Kennedy Instit	Lt Joseph P Kennedy Instit	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Non-MD Resident	1	DDA
CSLA	Maryland Community Connection	Maryland Community Connection	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Prince George's	1	DDA
CSLA	Maryland Community Connection	Maryland Community Connection	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Prince George's	1	DDA
CSLA	Maryland Community Connection	Maryland Community Connection	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Prince George's	1	DDA
CSLA	Maxim Health Care Servs.	Maxim Health Care Servs.	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Baltimore	1	DDA
CSLA	Melwood Horticultural Training Center	Melwood Horticultural Training Center	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Prince George's	1	DDA
CSLA	Melwood Horticultural Training Center	Melwood Horticultural Training Center	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Prince George's	1	DDA
CSLA	Richcroft	Richcroft	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Baltimore	2	DDA
CSLA	Richcroft	Richcroft	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Baltimore	1	DDA
CSLA	Richcroft	Richcroft	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Baltimore	1	DDA
CSLA	Richcroft	Richcroft	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Baltimore	1	DDA
CSLA	Somerset Community Services, Inc.	Somerset Community Services, Inc.	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Somerset	1	DDA
CSLA	Target, Inc.	Target, Inc.	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Carroll	1	DDA

CSLA	Target, Inc.	Target, Inc.	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Carroll	1	DDA
CSLA	The Arc Of The Central Chesapeake Region, Inc.	The Arc Of The Central Chesapeake Region, Inc.	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Anne Arundel	1	DDA
CSLA	The Arc Of The Central Chesapeake Region, Inc.	The Arc Of The Central Chesapeake Region, Inc.	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Anne Arundel	1	DDA
CSLA	The Arc Of The Central Chesapeake Region, Inc.	The Arc Of The Central Chesapeake Region, Inc.	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Anne Arundel	1	DDA
CSLA	The Arc Baltimore	The Arc Baltimore	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Baltimore	1	DDA
CSLA	The Arc Baltimore	The Arc Baltimore	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Baltimore	1	DDA
CSLA	The Arc Baltimore	The Arc Baltimore	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Baltimore	1	DDA
CSLA	The Arc Baltimore	The Arc Baltimore	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Baltimore	2	DDA
CSLA	The Arc Baltimore	The Arc Baltimore	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Baltimore	1	DDA
CSLA	The Arc Baltimore	The Arc Baltimore	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Baltimore	1	DDA
CSLA	The Arc Baltimore	The Arc Baltimore	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Baltimore	2	DDA
CSLA	Ucp Of Southern Md	Ucp Of Southern Md	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Anne Arundel	1	DDA
CSLA	Ucp Of Southern Md	Ucp Of Southern Md	DDA	CSLA	0	0	0	0	Anne Arundel	1	DDA

Independent Living	Compass, Inc.	Compass, Inc.	DDA	ALU	3	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DDA
Independent Living	Creative Options	Creative Options	DDA	ALU	2	0	0	0	Baltimore	1	DDA
Independent Living	Dove Pointe Residential Svc	Dove Pointe Residential Svc	DDA	ALU	4	0	0	0	Wicomico	1	DDA
Independent Living	Home Sweet Home-Dd, Inc	Home Sweet Home-Dd, Inc	DDA	ALU	3	0	0	0	Anne Arundel	2	DDA
Independent Living	Living Sans Frontieres, Inc.	Living Sans Frontieres, Inc.	DDA	ALU	2	0	0	0	Baltimore	1	DDA
Independent Living	NCIA/CBAI	NCIA/CBAI	DDA	ALU	3	0	0	0	Baltimore	1	DDA
Independent Living	Progressive Horizons	Progressive Horizons	DDA	ALU	2	0	0	0	Baltimore	2	DDA
Independent Living	Challengers Independent Living, Inc.		DHR	CPA: Independent Living	28	0	16	21	Baltimore	27	DHR
Independent Living	Wellington Incorporated		DHR	CPA: Independent Living	20	0	16	21	Prince George's	9	DHR
Independent Living	Jumoke, Inc.		DHR	CPA: Independent Living	35	0	16	21	Baltimore City	14	DHR
Independent Living	The National Center for Children and Families, Inc.		DHR	CPA: Independent Living	21	0	16	21	Montgomery	3	DHR
Independent Living	Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Washington, Inc.		DHR	CPA: Independent Living	24	0	16	20	Prince George's	9	DHR
Independent Living	Umbrella Therapeutic Services, Inc.		DHR	CPA: Independent Living	20	0	18	20	Prince George's	3	DHR
Independent Living	Mosaic Community Services, Inc.		DHR	CPA: Independent Living	12	0	16	21	Baltimore	7	DHR

Independent Living	New Pathways, Inc.		DHR	CPA: Independent Living	75	0	17	20	Baltimore City	54	DHR
Independent Living	Challengers Independent Living, Inc.	Challengers -- Berts Place Too - Treatment Foster Care (Private)15 Clifton Ave	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	12	7	15	19	Baltimore City	2	DHR
Independent Living	King Edwards' Inc.	King Edwards' Inc. ILP	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	32	0	16	21	Baltimore City	27	DHR
Independent Living	The Martin Pollak Project, Inc.	Martin Pollak Independent Living Program	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	30	0	16	20	Baltimore City	20	DHR
Independent Living	The Martin Pollak Project, Inc.	Martin Pollak Treatment Foster Care	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	115	0	0	20	Baltimore City	4	DHR
Independent Living	The National Center for Children and Families, Inc.	National Center for Children and Families CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	52	0	0	21	Montgomery	9	DHR
Independent Living	Transition Living Services, Inc.	Transition Living Services, Inc. CPA	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	25	0	16	21	Prince George's	17	DHR
Independent Living		Damamli Independent Living Program			0	0	0	0	Baltimore	3	DJS
Independent Living		Future Bound Independent Living Program			0	0	0	0	Montgomery	5	DJS
Independent Living		Jumoke - Independent Living			0	0	0	0	Baltimore City	1	DJS
Independent Living		Mentor Maryland - Baltimore Teens In Transition - Supervised Apartment Living-IL			0	0	0	0	Baltimore	7	DJS
Independent Living		New Pathways- Independence Plus			0	0	0	0	Baltimore City	1	DJS

Independent Living		The Board of Child Care- Alternatives for Youth and Families - Independent Living			0	0	0	0	St. Mary's	2	DJS
Independent Living		Transition Age Youth Program (TAY)			0	0	0	0	Baltimore	1	DJS
RCCP	CHESTERWYE CENTER	CHESTERWYE CENTER	DDA	GH	4	0	0	0	Queen Anne's	1	DDA
RCCP	SOMERSET COMMUNITY SERVICES, INC.	SOMERSET COMMUNITY SERVICES, INC.	DDA	GH	4	0	0	0	Somerset	1	DDA
RCCP	Adventist Healthcare, Inc.	Adventist Behavioral Health Cottage At North Potomac DHMH TGH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	4	8	12	17	Montgomery	7	DHR
RCCP	Adventist Healthcare, Inc.	Adventist Behavioral Health Cottage At Rockville DHMH TGH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	7	8	12	21	Montgomery	7	DHR
RCCP	All That Matters, Inc.	All That Matters -- Rhodena Place	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	8	8	14	18	Prince George's	5	DHR
RCCP	All That Matters, Inc. Foundation	All That Matters Foundation -- Bellgreen	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	8	8	13	17	Prince George's	8	DHR
RCCP	All That Matters, Inc. Foundation	All That Matters Foundation -- Chalfont	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	6	6	13	17	Prince George's	6	DHR
RCCP	The ARC of the Central Chesapeake Region, Inc	ARC of the Central Chesapeake Region, Inc Benton	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	3	15	19	Anne Arundel	2	DHR
RCCP	The ARC of the Central Chesapeake Region, Inc	ARC of the Central Chesapeake Region, Inc Forest View	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	3	14	20	Anne Arundel	1	DHR

RCCP	The ARC of the Central Chesapeake Region, Inc	ARC of the Central Chesapeake Region, Inc Main	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	3	15	19	Anne Arundel	2	DHR
RCCP	ARC of Washington County, Inc.	ARC of Washington County - Bridgewater	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	4	10	17	Washington	4	DHR
RCCP	ARC of Washington County, Inc.	ARC of Washington County - Foundations II	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	16	21	Washington	3	DHR
RCCP	ARC of Washington County, Inc.	ARC of Washington County - Potomac House	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	15	21	Washington	4	DHR
RCCP	ARC of Washington County, Inc.	ARC of Washington County	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	4	10	17	Washington	4	DHR
RCCP	ARC of Washington County, Inc.	ARC of Washington County - Jefferson House	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	4	10	17	Washington	3	DHR
RCCP	Aries Residential Services Incorporated	Aries Residential Services - 2014 Druid Hill	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	15	18	Baltimore City	5	DHR
RCCP	The Arrow Project Inc.	Arrow Child & Family - Diagnostic Center RCC	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	45	45	12	18	Baltimore	32	DHR
RCCP	The Arrow Project Inc.	Arrow Child & Family - Transitional Living RCC	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	18	18	16	21	Harford	17	DHR
RCCP	Associated Catholic Charities Inc.	Associated Catholic Charities St Vincents Child Care Center	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	70	70	3	13	Baltimore	19	DHR
RCCP	Associated Catholic Charities Inc.	Associated Catholic Charities Villa Maria TGH DHMH	DHMH	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	9	14	Baltimore	6	DHR
RCCP	Aunt Hattie`s Place, Inc.	Aunt Hattie`s Place, Inc. Maine	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	12	12	13	17	Baltimore City	9	DHR

RCCP	Aunt Hattie's Place, Inc.	Aunt Hattie's Place, Inc Shenton	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	15	19	Baltimore	2	DHR
RCCP	Aunt Hattie's Place, Inc.	Aunt Hattie's Place, Inc. Norwood Rd	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	8	8	13	17	Montgomery	8	DHR
RCCP	The Benedictine School For Exceptional Children, Incorporated	Benedictine -- Benedictine Lane	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	9	95	5	21	Caroline	9	DHR
RCCP	Board of Child Care of the United Methodist Church, Incorporated	Board of Child Care - DHMH TGH Prince Frederick	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	8	8	12	17	Calvert	5	DHR
RCCP	Board of Child Care of the United Methodist Church, Incorporated	Board of Child Care - DHMH TGH Waldorf	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	6	6	12	17	Charles	2	DHR
RCCP	Board of Child Care of the United Methodist Church, Incorporated	Board Of Child Care Colesville Group Home	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	8	8	7	18	Montgomery	4	DHR
RCCP	Board of Child Care of the United Methodist Church, Incorporated	Board of Child Care Girls Boys Shelter	DHR	RCC: Shelter Home	24	24	9	18	Baltimore	7	DHR
RCCP	Board of Child Care of the United Methodist Church, Incorporated	Board of Child Care Hagerstown Transitional	DHR	RCC: Shelter Home	4	4	15	19	Washington	4	DHR
RCCP	Board of Child Care of the United Methodist Church, Incorporated	Board of Child Care Main Campus Gaither Rd	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	85	85	9	21	Baltimore	77	DHR
RCCP	Board of Child Care of the United Methodist Church, Incorporated	Board of Child Care Nicodemus	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	15	20	Baltimore	3	DHR

RCCP	Board of Child Care of the United Methodist Church, Incorporated	Board of Child Care Rolling Road	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	4	15	20	Baltimore	1	DHR
RCCP	Brook Lane Health Services, Inc.	Brook Lane - Stone Bridge Transitional Care Respite	DHR	RCC: Respite	26	27	6	17	Washington	13	DHR
RCCP	Brotherhood and Sisterhood (BSI) International	Brotherhood and Sisterhood -- Blueridge	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	3	14	18	Montgomery	2	DHR
RCCP	Brotherhood and Sisterhood (BSI) International	Brotherhood and Sisterhood -- Dublin	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	3	16	19	Montgomery	2	DHR
RCCP	Brotherhood and Sisterhood (BSI) International	Brotherhood and Sisterhood -- Ingalls	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	3	14	18	Prince George's	3	DHR
RCCP	Care With Class, Inc.	Care With Class, Inc. - Apt A3	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	3	3	15	19	Baltimore City	1	DHR
RCCP	Care With Class, Inc.	Care With Class, Inc. - Apt B2	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	3	3	15	19	Baltimore City	1	DHR
RCCP	Cedar Ridge Children's Home and School, Inc.	Cedar Ridge - Jordan House	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	2	4	13	19	Washington	2	DHR
RCCP	Cedar Ridge Children's Home and School, Inc.	Cedar Ridge Children's Home	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	1	24	6	21	Washington	1	DHR
RCCP	Cedar Ridge Children's Home and School, Inc.	Cedar Ridge Children's Home DHMH	DHMH	RCC: Small Group Home	3	8	11	17	Washington	3	DHR
RCCP	Center for Social Change, Inc	Center for Social Change MFP Chapman	DDA	RCC: Medically Fragile	5	5	3	21	Baltimore	4	DHR
RCCP	Center for Social Change, Inc	Center for Social Change Springdell	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	9	21	Baltimore	2	DHR

RCCP	Challengers Independent Living, Inc.	Challengers -- Berts Place Too - Treatment Foster Care (Private)15 Clifton Ave	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	12	7	15	19	Baltimore City	5	DHR
RCCP	Challengers Independent Living, Inc.	Challengers Bert Place	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	16	19	Baltimore City	5	DHR
RCCP	Changing Lives at Home, Inc.	Changing Lives At Home, Inc.	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	15	19	Baltimore City	5	DHR
RCCP	The Children's Guild, Inc.	Childrens Guild Debuskey House DHMH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	8	8	12	18	Baltimore City	5	DHR
RCCP	The Children's Guild, Inc.	Childrens Guild Harford House DHMH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	8	8	12	18	Baltimore City	2	DHR
RCCP	The Children's Guild, Inc.	Childrens Guild Kanner House DHMH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	8	8	12	18	Baltimore City	4	DHR
RCCP	Children's Resources, Inc	Children's Resources, Inc - Shining Tree	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	14	14	13	16	Washington	2	DHR
RCCP	CIS & H Inc.	CIS & H Inc. Manchester	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	3	6	15	18	Prince George's	3	DHR
RCCP	CIS & H Inc.	CIS & H Inc. Bald Hill	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	6	8	10	14	Prince George's	5	DHR
RCCP	CIS & H Inc.	CIS & H Inc. Boykin	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	4	7	13	16	Prince George's	4	DHR
RCCP	Compassion Inc.	Compassion - 3934 Frisby Ave	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	16	19	Baltimore City	5	DHR
RCCP	Compassion Inc.	Compassion, Inc. Oakland	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	4	16	19	Baltimore City	4	DHR
RCCP	Concern - Professional for Children and Youth, Inc	CONCERN Lanham CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	85	0	0	21	Prince George's	5	DHR
RCCP	Creative Options, Inc.	Creative Options -	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	2	2	18	21	Baltimore	1	DHR

RCCP	Creative Options, Inc.	Creative Options -- Scarborough	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	2	2	17	21	Baltimore	1	DHR
RCCP	Community Services for Autistic Adults and Children, Inc.	CSAAC	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	1	3	0	21	Montgomery	1	DHR
RCCP	Community Services for Autistic Adults and Children, Inc.	CSAAC	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	1	3	16	21	Montgomery	1	DHR
RCCP	Community Services for Autistic Adults and Children, Inc.	CSAAC Horizon Run	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	1	3	12	21	Montgomery	1	DHR
RCCP	Day By Day Residential Services, Inc.	Day By Day Residential Services - Oakfield	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	14	18	Baltimore	6	DHR
RCCP	Devine Interventions, Inc.	Devine Intervention - Northwood	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	13	17	Baltimore City	3	DHR
RCCP	Dove Pointe, Inc.	Dove Pointe Residential Srvs - N Park Dr DDA	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	1	3	0	21	Wicomico	1	DHR
RCCP	F & N Children's Youth Home, Inc.	F & N Children's Youth Home -- Justin Way	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	14	17	Montgomery	3	DHR
RCCP	First Metropolitan Facilities Inc.	First Metropolitan - 6208 Auth	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	3	12	16	Prince George's	3	DHR
RCCP	First Metropolitan Facilities Inc.	First Metropolitan 6Treatment Foster Care (Private)2 Auth Road	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	12	16	Prince George's	5	DHR
RCCP	First Metropolitan Facilities Inc.	First Metropolitan Brooks Dr.	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	3	4	12	16	Prince George's	1	DHR
RCCP	First Metropolitan Facilities Inc.	First Metropolitan Dogwood Lane	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	9	13	Prince George's	4	DHR
RCCP	First Metropolitan Facilities Inc.	First Metropolitan Sydney Avenue	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	3	4	11	15	Prince George's	3	DHR

RCCP	Franklin Group Homes, Incorporated	Franklin Group Homes, Inc - Lorraine	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	15	18	Baltimore	3	DHR
RCCP	Franklin Group Homes, Incorporated	Franklin Group Homes, Inc - Wild Cherry	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	13	16	Baltimore	3	DHR
RCCP	Goliven Group Home, Inc.	Goliven Group Homes - St. Georges	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	13	17	Baltimore City	4	DHR
RCCP	GUIDE Program, Inc.	GUIDE Oak Lane DHMH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	5	6	13	18	Prince George's	1	DHR
RCCP	Head Injury Rehabilitation & Referral Services, Inc	Head Injury Rehab. & Ref. Srvs - 9800 Leatherfern	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	1	1	18	20	Montgomery	1	DHR
RCCP	Hearts and Homes For Youth, Inc.	Hearts and Homes - Helen Smith Girls Group Home	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	8	8	13	17	Montgomery	2	DHR
RCCP	Hearts and Homes For Youth, Inc.	Hearts and Homes - John C. Tracey Boys Group Home	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	8	8	13	17	Montgomery	1	DHR
RCCP	Hearts and Homes For Youth, Inc.	Hearts and Homes - Marys Mount Manor Girls DHMH TGH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	8	8	13	17	Anne Arundel	1	DHR
RCCP	Hearts and Homes For Youth, Inc.	Hearts and Homes - Redl House DHMH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	7	8	12	17	Montgomery	1	DHR
RCCP	Hebron Association for Community Services Inc.	Hebron Association - Frankfort Dr.	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	8	18	Montgomery	4	DHR
RCCP	Hebron Association for Community Services Inc.	Hebron Association - Philomen's Place -- Bauer	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	13	21	Montgomery	5	DHR
RCCP	Inner-County Outreach Incorporated	Inner-County Outreach - Edgewood	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	14	17	Harford	3	DHR

RCCP	Inner-County Outreach Incorporated	Inner-County Outreach	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	16	20	Baltimore City	4	DHR
RCCP	Inspiring Minds Inc.	Inspiring Minds -	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	4	16	20	Baltimore City	4	DHR
RCCP	JS Social Services, Inc	JS Social Services -- Youthtown USA I -	DHR	RCC: Shelter Home	4	4	15	18	Baltimore City	3	DHR
RCCP	JS Social Services, Inc	JS Social Services - Youthtown USA II - 12 Second	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	13	16	Baltimore City	2	DHR
RCCP	Jumoke, Inc.	Jumoke, Inc.	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	14	18	Baltimore City	5	DHR
RCCP	Jumoke, Inc.	Jumoke, Inc. Eveshem	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	4	17	19	Baltimore City	3	DHR
RCCP	Jumoke, Inc.	Jumoke, Inc. Gwynn	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	16	18	Baltimore City	5	DHR
RCCP	KHI Services, Inc.	KHI, Inc. Karma Academy for Boys Randallstown	DJJ	RCC: Small Group Home	4	8	14	18	Baltimore	1	DHR
RCCP	Knowledge Empowers You to Succeed, Inc.	Knowledge Empowers You to Succeed - Premiere House	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	8	8	17	20	Baltimore City	6	DHR
RCCP	The KOBA Institute, Inc.	KOBA - Mansion at Focus Point Clinton	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	1	8	13	17	Prince George's	1	DHR
RCCP	The KOBA Institute, Inc.	KOBA - Mansion at Focus Point Ft Washington	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	1	8	15	20	Prince George's	1	DHR
RCCP	The KOBA Institute, Inc.	KOBA - Mansion at Focus Point Oxon Hill	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	8	15	20	Prince George's	3	DHR
RCCP	The KOBA Institute, Inc.	KOBA - Mansion at Focus Point Silver Spring	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	8	8	13	20	Montgomery	3	DHR
RCCP	The KOBA Institute, Inc.	KOBA - Mansion at Focus Point Upper Marlboro	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	8	15	19	Prince George's	3	DHR

RCCP	Lazarus House Inc	Lazarus House Inc.	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	5	13	17	Baltimore City	3	DHR
RCCP	LifeLine Inc.	LifeLine 1F	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	3	14	20	Anne Arundel	3	DHR
RCCP	LifeLine Inc.	LifeLine 1A	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	3	15	19	Anne Arundel	3	DHR
RCCP	LifeLine Inc.	LifeLine 1D	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	3	14	19	Anne Arundel	3	DHR
RCCP	LifeLine Inc.	LifeLine 1E	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	3	3	9	20	Anne Arundel	3	DHR
RCCP	Linwood Center, Inc.	Linwood Center -- North Rogers	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	9	4	4	21	Howard	4	DHR
RCCP	Making A Great Individual Contribution, Inc.	MAGIC	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	3	4	13	18	Baltimore	4	DHR
RCCP	Making A Great Individual Contribution, Inc.	MAGIC	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	3	4	18	20	Baltimore	5	DHR
RCCP	Making A Great Individual Contribution, Inc.	MAGIC Purnell Drive	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	13	18	Baltimore	5	DHR
RCCP	Maple Shade Youth and Family Services, Inc.	Maple Shade Mardela Special Care DHMH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	8	8	8	18	Wicomico	5	DHR
RCCP	The Marlene B. Vinson Home Of New Beginnings, Inc.	Marlene B Vinson - Brookdale - Teen Mother Pgrm	DHR	RCC: Teen Mothers Program	2	4	16	21	Baltimore	1	DHR
RCCP	The Marlene B. Vinson Home Of New Beginnings, Inc.	Marlene B Vinson - Fairbrook - Adolescent Prgm	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	8	10	12	18	Baltimore	7	DHR
RCCP	The Maryland Salem Children's Trust, Inc.	Maryland Salem Children's Trust - Shelter	DHR	RCC: Shelter Home	8	8	6	18	Allegany	1	DHR

RCCP	The Maryland Salem Children's Trust, Inc.	Maryland Salem Children's Trust, Inc.	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	24	24	6	18	Allegany	9	DHR
RCCP	Maryland Sheriffs' Youth Ranch, Inc.	Maryland Sheriffs' Youth Ranch - Frederick	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	20	18	10	18	Frederick	6	DHR
RCCP	McJoy's Joy Covenant Inc.	McJoy's Joy Covenant - Althea Ave	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	8	8	15	18	Baltimore City	6	DHR
RCCP	Mosaic Community Services, Inc.	Mosaic Dulaney House DHMH TGH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	8	8	12	18	Howard	5	DHR
RCCP	Mosaic Community Services, Inc.	Mosaic Fordham Cottage DHMH TGH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	8	8	12	18	Baltimore	6	DHR
RCCP	Mosaic Community Services, Inc.	Mosaic Mac I DHMH TGH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	6	6	12	18	Howard	2	DHR
RCCP	Mumsey's Residential Care, Inc.	Mumsey's Residential Care - Devonshire	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	16	20	Baltimore City	2	DHR
RCCP	The National Center for Children and Families, Inc.	National Center for Children and Families RCC	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	20	20	12	20	Montgomery	5	DHR
RCCP	National Center on Institutions and Alternatives, Inc.	NCIA	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	1	4	17	21	Baltimore City	1	DHR
RCCP	National Center on Institutions and Alternatives, Inc.	NCIA	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	1	4	14	21	Baltimore City	2	DHR
RCCP	National Center on Institutions and Alternatives, Inc.	NCIA	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	3	4	17	21	Baltimore	1	DHR
RCCP	National Center on Institutions and Alternatives, Inc.	NCIA Innerdale	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	1	3	14	21	Baltimore	1	DHR

RCCP	National Center on Institutions and Alternatives, Inc.	NCIA Shoshone	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	3	4	17	21	Baltimore	2	DHR
RCCP	National Center on Institutions and Alternatives, Inc.	NCIA St. Andrews	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	3	3	15	19	Baltimore City	3	DHR
RCCP	National Center on Institutions and Alternatives, Inc.	NCIA Stonewood Road	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	3	3	14	17	Baltimore City	2	DHR
RCCP	Neighbor to Family, Inc.	Neighbor to Family Sibling Foster Care	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	96	0	0	20	Baltimore	1	DHR
RCCP	New Pathways, Inc.	New Pathways -- Second Generations CPA	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	24	0	16	21	Baltimore City	22	DHR
RCCP	Our Fortress Homes, Inc.	Our Fortress Homes -- Hilton DHMH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	8	8	14	18	Baltimore City	5	DHR
RCCP	Our Fortress Homes, Inc.	Our Fortress Homes -- Parkside DHMH	DHMH	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	13	17	Baltimore City	3	DHR
RCCP	The Place for Children, Incorporated	Place for Children	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	3	3	12	15	Baltimore	1	DHR
RCCP	The Place for Children, Incorporated	Place for Children Vosges	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	4	12	15	Baltimore	2	DHR
RCCP	Rolling Vista Place Incorporated	Rolling Vista Place - Wyanoke	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	8	8	14	18	Baltimore City	4	DHR
RCCP	San Mar Children`s Home, Inc.	San Mar Children's Home, Inc Group Home	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	25	14	12	18	Washington	8	DHR
RCCP	San Mar Children`s Home, Inc.	San Mar Jack E Barr DHMH TGH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	8	8	13	18	Washington	5	DHR
RCCP	Sarah's House, Inc.	Sarah's House I --	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	17	20	Baltimore City	6	DHR
RCCP	Sarah's House, Inc.	Sarah's House II	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	18	20	Baltimore City	6	DHR

RCCP	Second Chance Services Unlimited, Inc.	Second Chance - Heming DDA	DDA	RCC: Large Group Home	3	10	0	20	Prince George's	3	DHR
RCCP	Second Chance Services Unlimited, Inc.	Second Chance - Kennison DDA	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	3	5	0	20	Prince George's	3	DHR
RCCP	Second Chance Services Unlimited, Inc.	Second Chance Seth Court DDA	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	4	6	12	16	Prince George's	4	DHR
RCCP	Second Family, Inc.	Second Family - 1009 Minna	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	4	4	0	21	Prince George's	2	DHR
RCCP	Second Family, Inc.	Second Family - 1009 Minna	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	4	0	21	Prince George's	1	DHR
RCCP	Second Family, Inc.	Second Family -- 14101 Lancaster Lane	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	5	5	0	11	Prince George's	5	DHR
RCCP	Second Family, Inc.	Second Family - 15206 Old Chapel Road	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	6	5	0	21	Prince George's	6	DHR
RCCP	Second Family, Inc.	Second Family 1006 Minna	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	5	6	0	21	Prince George's	5	DHR
RCCP	Second Family, Inc.	Second Family 1008 Nyanga	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	0	21	Prince George's	2	DHR
RCCP	Second Family, Inc.	Second Family 1010 Nyanga	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	3	0	21	Prince George's	2	DHR
RCCP	Second Family, Inc.	Second Family 1015 Minna	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	4	4	0	21	Prince George's	4	DHR
RCCP	Sheppard Pratt Health System, Inc.	Sheppard Pratt High Intensity Adolescent Respite Program	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	24	24	11	21	Baltimore	11	DHR
RCCP	Shorehaven, Inc	Shorehaven 108 Continental	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	13	21	Cecil	3	DHR
RCCP	Shorehaven, Inc	Shorehaven Mary Anita	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	13	21	Cecil	4	DHR
RCCP	Shorehaven, Inc	Shorehaven Park Towne	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	6	16	Cecil	2	DHR

RCCP	Shorehaven, Inc	Shorehaven Pine Valley	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	13	21	Cecil	2	DHR
RCCP	Shorehaven, Inc	Shorehaven Short Cut	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	13	21	Cecil	3	DHR
RCCP	Shorehaven, Inc	Shorehaven Vanderlyn	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	13	21	Cecil	3	DHR
RCCP	St. Ann`s Infant and Maternity Home	St. Ann's Infant & Maternity, Inc. Group Home	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	44	109	0	21	Prince George's	2	DHR
RCCP	Starflight Enterprises, Inc.	Starflight Clarks Ln	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	15	20	Baltimore City	2	DHR
RCCP	Starflight Enterprises, Inc.	Starflight Meadow Ave	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	15	20	Baltimore	2	DHR
RCCP	Starflight Enterprises, Inc.	Starflight Rocky Brook Ct	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	4	15	20	Baltimore	2	DHR
RCCP	Starflight Enterprises, Inc.	Starflight Silver Creek	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	15	20	Baltimore	3	DHR
RCCP	Starrs Group Home, Inc.	Starrs Group Home -- Maine	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	6	17	20	Baltimore	6	DHR
RCCP	Structures Youth Home, Inc.	Structures Youth Home --	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	3	7	14	18	Charles	4	DHR
RCCP	Structures Youth Home, Inc.	Structures Youth Home, Inc. -- Treatment Foster Care (Private)	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	7	8	14	18	Charles	6	DHR
RCCP	Tender Care	Tender Care -	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	5	5	13	18	Wicomico	2	DHR
RCCP	The Children's Home, Inc.	The Children's Home - - Diagnostic & Treatment	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	16	16	13	19	Baltimore	14	DHR
RCCP	The Children's Home, Inc.	The Children's Home Long Term Care Group Home	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	48	48	13	20	Baltimore	23	DHR
RCCP	The Children's Home, Inc.	The Children's Home Transitional Living	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	8	8	13	17	Baltimore	7	DHR

RCCP	Transformations, Inc.	Transformations -- Windsor	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	10	10	15	19	Baltimore City	9	DHR
RCCP	Trimir Home for Children and Families, Inc.	Trimir Home for Children and Families - Westview Lane	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	15	19	Prince George's	5	DHR
RCCP	Trivisions Inc.	Trivisions Inc. -- Forest Park	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	7	7	13	17	Baltimore	4	DHR
RCCP	Tuttie`s Place	Tuttie's Place -- Treatment Foster Care (Private)	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	16	16	16	21	Baltimore City	16	DHR
RCCP	Tuttie`s Place	Tuttie's Place	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	9	9	16	20	Baltimore	2	DHR
RCCP	Tuttie`s Place	Tuttie's Place	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	14	17	Baltimore	4	DHR
RCCP	Tuttie`s Place	Tuttie's Place Treatment Foster Care (Private)	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	16	21	Baltimore City	2	DHR
RCCP	Williams Life Center, Inc.	Williams Life Center, Inc. - Mason	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	8	8	15	18	Prince George's	8	DHR
RCCP	Williams Life Center, Inc.	Williams Life Center, Inc. - Stratford	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	8	8	14	18	Prince George's	8	DHR
RCCP	Woodbourne Center, Inc.	Woodbourne Center - Diagnostic	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	16	16	12	17	Baltimore City	4	DHR
RCCP	Youth Enterprises Services, Inc.	Youth Enterprises Services Inc -- Lincoln House	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	4	16	20	Baltimore	4	DHR
RCCP	Youth Enterprises Services, Inc.	Youth Enterprises Services, Inc. -- Gwynn Oak House	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	8	8	16	20	Baltimore City	8	DHR
RCCP	Youth-Vision Services, Inc.	Youth-Vision Services - Crandall	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	16	20	Prince George's	6	DHR
RCCP		Allegany County Girls Group Home			0	0	0	0	Allegany	6	DJS

RCCP		ARC of Washington County- Foundations			0	0	0	0	Washington	1	DJS
RCCP		Arrow Child and Family Ministries - Transitional Living Program			0	0	0	0	Harford	2	DJS
RCCP		Baltimore Adolescent Treatment Guidance Organization, Inc - B.A.T.G.O			0	0	0	0	Baltimore City	1	DJS
RCCP		Bay Shore Services, Inc			0	0	0	0	Wicomico	1	DJS
RCCP		Big Pine Childrens Home - Group Home			0	0	0	0	Washington	2	DJS
RCCP		Cedar Ridge Group Home			0	0	0	0	Washington	17	DJS
RCCP		Cedar Ridge Therapeutic Group Home			0	0	0	0	Washington	5	DJS
RCCP		Children's Home Group Home			0	0	0	0	Baltimore	1	DJS
RCCP		Greentree Adolescent Group Home			0	0	0	0	Montgomery	13	DJS
RCCP		Guide Ft. Washington Therapeutic Group Home			0	0	0	0	Prince George's	4	DJS
RCCP		Guide- Therapeutic Group Home Baltimore City			0	0	0	0	Baltimore City	5	DJS
RCCP		Hearts & Homes for Youth - Jump Start			0	0	0	0	Prince George's	7	DJS
RCCP		Hearts & Homes for Youth - Kemp Mill Group Home			0	0	0	0	Montgomery	6	DJS
RCCP		Hearts & Homes for Youth -John C. Tracey Grp Home			0	0	0	0	Montgomery	5	DJS

RCCP		Hearts & Homes for Youth- Mary's Mount Manor TGH				0	0	0	0	Anne Arundel	7	DJS
RCCP		Hearts & Homes for Youth-Helen Smith Girls GH				0	0	0	0	Montgomery	5	DJS
RCCP		Hearts and Homes - Redl House				0	0	0	0	Montgomery	6	DJS
RCCP		Jumoke - Group Homes				0	0	0	0	Baltimore City	1	DJS
RCCP		Karma Academy for Boys -Randallstown				0	0	0	0	Baltimore	6	DJS
RCCP		Kent Youth Boys Group Home				0	0	0	0	Kent	9	DJS
RCCP		Knowledge Empowers You To Succeed, Inc. (KEYS).				0	0	0	0	Baltimore City	1	DJS
RCCP		Maryland Salem Children's Trust Group Home				0	0	0	0	Allegany	1	DJS
RCCP		Maryland Sheriff's Youth Ranch. Inc				0	0	0	0	Frederick	8	DJS
RCCP		Mosaic I and II				0	0	0	0	Howard	1	DJS
RCCP		NCIA -Youth in Transition Program				0	0	0	0	Baltimore	21	DJS
RCCP		Oak Hill House-us Fellowship Inc				0	0	0	0	Washington	12	DJS
RCCP		One Love Group Home - Building Communities Today for Tomorrow				0	0	0	0	Baltimore City	1	DJS
RCCP		Our House Youth Home				0	0	0	0	Montgomery	14	DJS
RCCP		Potomac Ridge Crownsville Group Home				0	0	0	0	Anne Arundel	13	DJS

RCCP		Salem Residential Group Home (Western MD)			0	0	0	0	Allegany	3	DJS
RCCP		San Mar- Anna Findlay Group Home			0	0	0	0	Washington	6	DJS
RCCP		San Mar Jack E. Barr Therapeutic Group Home			0	0	0	0	Washington	2	DJS
RCCP		Shiningtree Childrens Home			0	0	0	0	Washington	7	DJS
RCCP		The Board of Child Care - Alternatives for Youth- The Lighthouse Girls TGH			0	0	0	0	Charles	2	DJS
RCCP		The Board of Child Care - Alternatives for Youth- Triad House - (Boys)TGH.			0	0	0	0	Calvert	1	DJS
RCCP		The Board of Child Care - Group Home			0	0	0	0	Baltimore City	9	DJS
RCCP		The Way Home-Mt Manor			0	0	0	0	Baltimore City	5	DJS

Total Placements 1469

Family Home Settings

Sub-Category	Organization	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reported Agency
	Family Home Settings	Public			0	0	0	0		3648	DHR
Foster Care		Follin, Deb Foster Care			0	0	0	0	Frederick	1	DJS
Foster Care		Castle, John and Nancy - Foster Care			0	0	0	0	Washington	2	DJS
Foster Care		Durst, Jennifer and Randall - Foster Care			0	0	0	0	Garrett	1	DJS
Foster Care		Hamilton, Melinda Foster Care			0	0	0	0	Washington	1	DJS
Foster Care		Joseph and Debra McCarney Foster Care			0	0	0	0	Washington	1	DJS
Foster Care		Thomas, Henry and Tiquita - Foster Care			0	0	0	0	Frederick	1	DJS
Restricted Relative Care	Second Home, Incorporated	Second Home CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	37	0	0	21	Baltimore City	28	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	WIN Family Services, Inc.	WIN Family Services, Inc. CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	86	0	0	21	Baltimore City	60	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	The Children's Choice Of Maryland, Inc.	Children's Choice Baltimore	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	115	0	0	20	Baltimore City	41	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	Residential Care, Inc.	Residential Care, Inc.	DHR	CPA: Treatment	47	0	0	20	Anne Arundel	3	DHR

Care		Crofton		Foster Care								
Restricted Relative Care	Woodbourne Center, Inc.	Woodbourne - Treatment Foster Care	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	112	0	0	21	Baltimore	50	DHR	
Restricted Relative Care	Residential Care, Inc.	Residential Care, Inc. Baltimore	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	69	0	0	20	Baltimore City	61	DHR	
Restricted Relative Care	The National Center for Children and Families, Inc.	National Center for Children and Families CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	53	0	0	21	Montgomery	19	DHR	
Restricted Relative Care	PSI Services, Inc.	PSI Services - Baltimore	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	78	0	0	21	Baltimore	49	DHR	
Restricted Relative Care	Hearts and Homes For Youth, Inc.	Hearts and Homes - Damamli Independent Living	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	46	0	18	21	Baltimore	17	DHR	
Restricted Relative Care	Pressley Ridge, Inc.	Pressley Ridge Baltimore	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	70	0	0	21	Baltimore City	47	DHR	
Restricted Relative Care	Hearts and Homes For Youth, Inc.	Hearts and Homes - Family Ties Treatment Foster Care	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	27	0	0	21	Montgomery	14	DHR	
Restricted Relative Care	The Children's Choice Of Maryland, Inc.	Childrens Choice Salisbury	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	112	0	0	20	Wicomico	20	DHR	
Restricted Relative Care	Maple Shade Youth and Family Services, Inc.	Maple Shade TFC	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	21	0	0	21	Wicomico	9	DHR	

Restricted Relative Care	The Children's Choice Of Maryland, Inc.	Childrens Choice Stevensville	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	110	0	0	20	Queen Anne's	17	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	Board of Child Care of the United Methodist Church, Incorporated	Board of Child Care TFC	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	27	0	0	21	Baltimore	21	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	Associated Catholic Charities Inc.	Associated Catholic Charities, TFC, 1 Treatment Foster Care (Private)1 Continental Dr	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	105	0	0	21	Harford	22	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	Between Friends, Inc.	Between Friends -- Baltimore	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	30	0	0	21	Baltimore City	23	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	The Children's Guild, Inc.	Children's Guild TFC	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	60	0	0	21	Baltimore City	52	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	Contemporary Family Services, Inc.	Contemporary Family Services (Hyattsville)	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	243	0	0	21	Prince George's	155	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	Good Children in the Making, Inc.	Good Children in the Making - Family Services TFC	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	18	0	0	21	Prince George's	6	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	Progressive Horizons, Inc.	Progressive Horizons CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	30	0	0	20	Baltimore	12	DHR

Restricted Relative Care	Center for Progressive Learning, Inc.	Center for Progressive Learning DDA	DDA	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	22	0	0	21	Baltimore	7	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	MENTOR Maryland, Inc.	MENTOR Maryland Caton Center TFC	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	75	0	0	21	Baltimore	7	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	Contemporary Family Services, Inc.	Contemporary Family Services (Baltimore)	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	246	0	0	21	Baltimore City	48	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	Kennedy Krieger Institute, Inc.	Kennedy Krieger TFC Program	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	153	0	0	21	Baltimore City	79	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	MENTOR Maryland, Inc.	MENTOR Maryland - Salisbury	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	75	0	0	21	Wicomico	8	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	MENTOR Maryland, Inc.	MENTOR Maryland - Easton	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	367	0	0	21	Talbot	34	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	The Arrow Project Inc.	Arrow Child & Family - CPA TFC Salisbury	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	17	0	0	18	Wicomico	12	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	Parker Therapeutic Services, Inc.	Parker Therapeutic Services - Baltimore	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	43	0	0	20	Baltimore City	45	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	Progressive Life Center, Inc.	Progressive Life Center -	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	65	0	0	20	Baltimore City	5	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	NHS Maryland	NHS Maryland CPA - Rockville	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	5	0	12	17	Montgomery	3	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	Community Solutions, Inc.	Community Solutions, Inc - CPA Towson	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	5	0	12	18	Baltimore	4	DHR

Restricted Relative Care	Board of Child Care of the United Methodist Church, Incorporated	Board of Child Care TFC - Charlotte Hall	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	7	0	0	21	St. Mary's	4	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	Seraaj Family Homes, Inc.	Seraaj Family Homes - Riverdale CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	31	0	0	21	Prince George's	2	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	Progressive Life Center, Inc.	Progressive Life Center, Inc. - Landover TFC	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	69	0	0	20	Prince George's	34	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	King Edwards' Inc.	King Edwards' Inc. ILP	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	33	0	16	21	Baltimore City	1	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	Casey Family Services	The Annie E. Casey Foundation, Inc. TFC Baltimore	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	36	0	0	20	Baltimore City	24	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	The Martin Pollak Project, Inc.	Martin Pollak Independent Living Program	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	29	0	16	20	Baltimore City	1	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	The Martin Pollak Project, Inc.	Martin Pollak Treatment Foster Care	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	114	0	0	20	Baltimore City	77	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	Foundations for Home and Community, Inc.	Foundations For Home and Community CPA-Clinton	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	121	0	0	21	Prince George's	97	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	CONCERN - Professional for Children and Youth, Inc	CONCERN Lanham CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	84	0	0	21	Prince George's	54	DHR

Restricted Relative Care	Neighbor to Family, Inc.	Neighbor to Family Sibling Foster Care	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	95	0	0	20	Baltimore	69	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	MENTOR Maryland, Inc.	MENTOR Maryland -	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	443	0	0	21	Baltimore	211	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	Williams Life Center, Inc.	Williams Life Center, Inc. CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	27	0	0	21	Prince George's	30	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	Family and Children's Services of Central Maryland Inc.	Family and Children's Services of Central MD CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	94	0	0	21	Baltimore City	11	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	Transition Living Services, Inc.	Transition Living Services, Inc. CPA	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	24	0	16	21	Prince George's	3	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	Baptist Family and Children's Services of Maryland, Inc.	Baptist Family and Children's Services Columbia CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	61	0	0	21	Howard	36	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	KidsPeace National Centers of North America, Inc.	KidsPeace CPA - Columbia	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	42	0	0	21	Howard	35	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	Associated Catholic Charities Inc.	Associated Catholic Charities, TFC, Baltimore	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	104	0	0	21	Baltimore City	53	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	PSI Services, Inc.	PSI Services - Chevy Chase	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	28	0	0	21	Montgomery	1	DHR

Restricted Relative Care	The Children's Home, Inc.	The Children's Home Edgewood Street Treatment Foster Care	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	46	0	0	21	Baltimore	22	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	San Mar Children's Home, Inc.	San Mar Children's Home Inc. TFC	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	35	0	0	21	Washington	30	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	Baltimore Adolescent Treatment Guidance Organization, Inc.	Baltimore Adolescent Treatment Guidance Organization CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	29	0	16	21	Baltimore City	17	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	Sheridan Patterson Center for Holistic Family Services, Inc	Sheridan Patterson Center CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	43	0	0	15	Baltimore	20	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	The Arrow Project Inc.	Arrow Child & Family - CPA TFC Baltimore	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	92	0	0	18	Baltimore	76	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	Pressley Ridge, Inc.	Pressley Ridge Cumberland	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	53	0	0	21	Allegany	20	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	The ARC Of Baltimore, Inc.	Arc Of Baltimore Treatment and Specialized FC	DHR	CPA: TFC Medically Fragile	110	0	0	20	Baltimore	41	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	The ARC Northern Chesapeake Region,	ARC Northern Chesapeake Aberdeen	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	41	0	0	21	Harford	29	DHR

	Incorporated										
Restricted Relative Care		San Mar Treatment Foster Care			0	0	0	0	Washington	1	DJS
Restricted Relative Care		Woodbourne Center Treatment Foster Care			0	0	0	0	Baltimore City	1	DJS
Restricted Relative Care		The Board of Child Care-Alternatives for Youth and Families-TFC -Southern MD			0	0	0	0	St. Mary's	1	DJS
Restricted Relative Care		The Board of Child Care - Alternatives for Youth - TRIAD Care - TFC			0	0	0	0	St. Mary's	1	DJS
Restricted Relative Care		Pressley Ridge - Treatment Foster Care			0	0	0	0	Allegany	12	DJS
Restricted Relative Care		Multi-Dimensional TFC (Montgomery Co.)- Northwestern Human Services of PA, Inc.			0	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DJS

Restricted Relative Care		Multi-Dimensional TFC (Baltimore County) - Community Solutions, Inc.			0	0	0	0	Baltimore	3	DJS
Restricted Relative Care		Mentor Maryland-Salisbury Teens In Transition - TFC			0	0	0	0	Wicomico	1	DJS
Restricted Relative Care		Mentor Maryland - Easton Children's Services			0	0	0	0	Talbot	11	DJS
Restricted Relative Care		Mentor Maryland - Community Based Services			0	0	0	0	Baltimore	16	DJS
Restricted Relative Care		Mentor Maryland - Baltimore Teens In Transition - TFC			0	0	0	0	Anne Arundel	10	DJS
Restricted Relative Care		Maple Shade After Care - Treatment Foster Care			0	0	0	0	Wicomico	1	DJS
Restricted Relative Care		Hearts & Homes for Youth - Family Ties Treat FC			0	0	0	0	Montgomery	3	DJS

Restricted Relative Care		Contemporary Family Services, Inc			0	0	0	0	Prince George's	3	DJS
Restricted Relative Care		Foundations for Home and Community			0	0	0	0	Charles	1	DJS
Restricted Relative Care		Concern - Treatment Foster Care			0	0	0	0	Washington	1	DJS
Restricted Relative Care		Arrow Child and Family Ministries - Foster Care			0	0	0	0	Baltimore	1	DJS

Total Placements 5699

Non-Community-Based Residential Placement

Sub-Category	Organization	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reported Agency
	Non-Community Based Residential Placement	Public			0	0	0	0		122	DHR
ASAM	Mountain Manor Treatment	Mountain Manor	OHCQ	General	0	30	0	17	Baltimore City	46	ADAA
ASAM	Recovery Network	Recovery Network	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	0	Baltimore City	1	ADAA
ASAM	Recovery Network	Recovery Network	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	0	Baltimore City	2	ADAA
ASAM	Anne Arundel Medical Center	Pathways	OHCQ	General	0	8	0	17	Anne Arundel	3	ADAA

ASAM	Anne Arundel Medical Center	Pathways	OHCQ	General	0	8	0	17	Anne Arundel	1	ADAA
ASAM	The Carol M. Porto Treatment Center	Carol M. Porto Treatment Center	OHCQ	General	0	48	0	0	Calvert	1	ADAA
ASAM	Maryland Treatment Centers	Avery Road Combined Care	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	ADAA
ASAM	Recovery Network	Recovery Network	OHCQ	General	0	8	0	0	Baltimore City	2	ADAA
ASAM	Shoemaker Center	Shoemaker Center	OHCQ	General	0	50	0	0	Carroll	4	ADAA
ASAM	Carroll County Health Dept.	Spectrum	OHCQ	General	0	96	0	0	Carroll	2	ADAA
ASAM	Gaudenzia, Inc.	Gaudenzia Prisons - Patuxent Institution	OHCQ	General	0	48	0	0	Howard	6	ADAA
ASAM	Gaudenzia, Inc.	Gaudenzia Prisons - Central Laundry	OHCQ	General	0	256	0	0	Carroll	19	ADAA
ASAM	Gaudenzia, Inc.	Gaudenzia Prisons - Hagerstown	OHCQ	General	0	90	0	0	Washington	2	ADAA
ASAM	Tuerk House, Inc.	Tuerk House	OHCQ	General	0	70	0	0	Baltimore City	2	ADAA
ASAM	Howard County Health Dept.	Howard County Halfway House	OHCQ	General	0	14	0	0	Howard	2	ADAA
ASAM	Mountain Manor Treatment	Mountain Manor	OHCQ	General	0	30	0	17	Baltimore City	2	ADAA
ASAM	Wilson House	Faith House	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	0	Baltimore City	1	ADAA
ASAM	Warwick Manor Behavioral Health, Inc.	Warwick Manor	OHCQ	General	0	6	0	0	Dorchester	5	ADAA

ASAM	Allegany County Health Dept.	Jackson Unit	OHCQ	General	0	40	0	0	Allegany	41	ADAA
ASAM	The W House, Inc.	W House	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	0	Washington	2	ADAA
ASAM	Mountain Manor Emmitsburg	Mountain Manor	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	0	Frederick	1	ADAA
ASAM	Reality, Inc.	Reality House	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	0	Prince George's	3	ADAA
ASAM	Lawrence Court	Lawrence Court	OHCQ	General	0	20	0	0	Montgomery	1	ADAA
ASAM	Wells House	Wells House East	OHCQ	General	0	17	0	0	Washington	1	ADAA
ASAM	Addictions Recovery, Inc.	Hope House	OHCQ	General	0	70	0	0	Anne Arundel	2	ADAA
ASAM	Addictions Recovery, Inc.	Hope House	OHCQ	General	0	70	0	0	Anne Arundel	1	ADAA
ASAM	Avery Road Treatment Center	Avery Road	OHCQ	General	0	60	0	0	Montgomery	1	ADAA
ASAM	Walden Sierra, Inc.	Walden Sierra	OHCQ	General	0	42	0	0	St. Mary's	1	ADAA
ASAM	Walden Sierra, Inc.	Walden Sierra	OHCQ	General	0	42	0	0	St. Mary's	1	ADAA
ASAM	Walden Sierra, Inc.	Walden Sierra	OHCQ	General	0	42	0	0	St. Mary's	1	ADAA
ASAM	Samaritan House	Samaritan House	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	0	Anne Arundel	1	ADAA
ASAM	Right Turn of MD	Right Turn of MD	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	0	Baltimore	1	ADAA
ASAM	Second Genesis, Inc.	Second Genesis Crownsville	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	0	Anne Arundel	2	ADAA
ASAM	Gale Houses, Inc.	Olson House	OHCQ	General	0	21	0	0	Frederick	1	ADAA
ASAM	Gale Houses, Inc.	Gale House	OHCQ	General	0	12	0	0	Frederick	1	ADAA

ASAM	Damascus House, Inc.	Damascus House	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	0	Anne Arundel	1	ADAA
ASAM	Mann House, Inc.	Mann House	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	0	Harford	1	ADAA
ASAM	Farther Martin's Ashley	Father Martin's Ashley	OHCQ	General	0	11	0	0	Harford	11	ADAA
ASAM	Washington County Health Dept.	Catoctin Summit	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	17	Frederick	14	ADAA
ASAM	Kent County Health Dept.	A.F. Whitsitt Center	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	0	Kent	3	ADAA
ASAM	Kent County Health Dept.	A.F. Whitsitt Center	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	0	Kent	1	ADAA
ASAM	Second Genesis, Inc.	Second Genesis Melwood	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	0	Prince George's	1	ADAA
ASAM	Second Genesis, Inc.	Second Genesis Melwood	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	0	Prince George's	1	ADAA
ASAM	Allegany County Health Dept.	Massie Unit	OHCQ	General	0	24	0	0	Allegany	3	ADAA
ASAM	Gaundenzia	Gaundenzia Owings Mills	OHCQ	General	0	80	0	0	Baltimore	1	ADAA
ASAM	Gaundenzia	Gaundenzia Park Heights	OHCQ	General	0	170	0	0	Baltimore City	1	ADAA
ASAM	Chrysalis House, Inc.	Chrysalis House	OHCQ	General	0	45	0	0	Anne Arundel	1	ADAA
ASAM	Gaundenzia	Gaundenzia at Woodland	OHCQ	General	0	240	0	0	Baltimore City	1	ADAA
ASAM		William Donald Schaefer House			0	0	0	0	Baltimore City	7	DJS
ASAM		Rite of Passage - Silver Oak Academy			0	0	0	0	Carroll	47	DJS
ASAM		Mountain Manor Drug Treatment Center			0	0	0	0	Baltimore City	14	DJS

ASAM		Morning Star Youth Academy			0	0	0	0	Dorchester	27	DJS
ASAM		Meadow Mountain Youth Center			0	0	0	0	Garrett	39	DJS
ASAM		Lois E. Jackson Unit-Addictions Program			0	0	0	0	Allegany	23	DJS
ASAM		Catoctin Summit Adol. Prog.			0	0	0	0	Frederick	9	DJS
Detention		Victor Cullen Center			0	0	0	0	Frederick	45	DJS
Detention		Savage Mountain Youth Center			0	0	0	0	Allegany	36	DJS
Detention		Green Ridge Youth Center			0	0	0	0	Allegany	28	DJS
Detention		Green Ridge - Mountain Quest			0	0	0	0	Allegany	10	DJS
Detention		Backbone Mountain Youth Center			0	0	0	0	Garrett	47	DJS
DETP		Woodbourne Children Diag Treat Center -CEU			0	0	0	0	Baltimore	8	DJS
DETP		RICA - Rockville CEU Diagnostic			0	0	0	0	Montgomery	2	DJS
NonSecure		Waxter Children's Center(Maximum)Secure Treatment			0	0	0	0	Anne Arundel	7	DJS
RTC	Rica - Regional Institute For Children & Adolescents	RICA Rockville RTC	DHMH	Residential Treatment Center	80	80	0	21	Montgomery	4	DHR
RTC	Adventist Healthcare, Inc.	Adventist Behavioral Health Anne Arundel RTC	DHMH	Residential Treatment Center	14	26	0	20	Anne Arundel	11	DHR

RTC	Adventist Healthcare, Inc.	Adventist Behavioral Health Eastern Shore RTC	DHMH	Residential Treatment Center	14	59	0	20	Dorchester	10	DHR
RTC	Woodbourne Center, Inc.	Woodbourne Center RTC	DHMH	Residential Treatment Center	54	54	0	20	Baltimore City	10	DHR
RTC	Sheppard Pratt Health System, Inc.	Sheppard Pratt -- The Jefferson School RTC	DHMH	Residential Treatment Center	53	53	12	20	Frederick	18	DHR
RTC	Good Shepherd Center	Good Shepherd Center RTC	DHMH	Residential Treatment Center	105	105	0	20	Baltimore	34	DHR
RTC	Adventist Healthcare, Inc.	Adventist Behavioral Health Rockville RTC	DHMH	Residential Treatment Center	48	88	0	20	Montgomery	7	DHR
RTC	Associated Catholic Charities Inc.	Associated Catholic Charities -- Villa Maria RTC	DHMH	Residential Treatment Center	95	95	0	20	Baltimore	34	DHR
RTC	Rica - Regional Institute For Children & Adolescents	RICA Baltimore RTC	DHMH	Residential Treatment Center	45	45	0	21	Baltimore City	20	DHR
RTC	Sheppard Pratt Health System, Inc.	Sheppard Pratt Berkeley & Eleanor Mann RTC	DHMH	Residential Treatment Center	48	48	12	20	Baltimore	35	DHR
RTC		RICA- Baltimore Residential Treatment Center			0	0	0	0	Baltimore City	10	DJS
RTC		RICA - Rockville RTC			0	0	0	0	Montgomery	4	DJS
RTC		Potomac Ridge Residential Treatment Center			0	0	0	0	Montgomery	15	DJS
RTC		Potomac Ridge Behavioral Health - Eastern Shore			0	0	0	0	Dorchester	22	DJS

RTC		Potomac Ridge Behavioral Health- Anne Arundel			0	0	0	0	Anne Arundel	8	DJS
RTC		New Directions Chesapeake Treatment Center- Hickey			0	0	0	0	Baltimore	19	DJS
RTC		Jefferson School			0	0	0	0	Frederick	12	DJS
RTC		Good Shepherd Center Males Program			0	0	0	0	Baltimore	3	DJS
RTC		Thomas O'Farrell Youth Center Respite			0	0	0	0	Carroll	1	DJS
RTC		Villa Maria Residential Treatment Center			0	0	0	0	Baltimore	2	DJS
RTC		Good Shepherd Center - Female Program			0	0	0	0	Baltimore	26	DJS
RTC		Sheppard Pratt Towson MANN RTC			0	0	0	0	Baltimore	7	DJS
RTC		Woodbourne Residential Treatment Center			0	0	0	0	Baltimore City	28	DJS
RTC	Regional Institute for Children & Adolescents	Regional Institute for Children & Adolescents- Baltimore	OHCQ	Residential Treatment Center	45	45	0	120	Baltimore City	41	MHA
RTC	Regional Institute for Children & Adolescents	Regional Institute for Children & Adolescents- Rockville	OHCQ	Residential Treatment Center	80	80	0	120	Montgomery	30	MHA
RTC	Regional Institute for Children & Adolescents	Regional Institute for Children & Adolescents		Residential Treatment Center	0	0	0	120		358	MHA

Total Placements 1444

Hospitalization

Sub-Category	Organization	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reported Agency
	Hospitalization	Public			0	0	0	0		38	DHR
Psych		Potomac Ridge Eastern Shore Acute Unit			0	0	0	0	Dorchester	1	DJS
Psych		Spring Grove Hospital Center			0	0	0	0	Baltimore	4	DJS

Total Placements 43**Unknown**

Sub-Category	Organization	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reported Agency
Unknown	Unknown	Public			0	0	0	0		335	DHR

Total Placements 335

Appendix C: FY 2011 Out-Of-State Placements Capacity & Utilization by Placement Category & Agency

FY 2011 Capacity Utilization – Out-of-State Placements

One-Day Census

This one-day census is a summary of participating providers in relation to placements on January 31, 2011 as reported by the child-serving agencies excluding MSDE. The list is separated into the five macro-placement categories including the unknown category and further sorted by the sub-category and reporting agency.

Community-Based Residential Placement

#	Sub-Category	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	State	Total	Reported Agency
1	RCCP	AdvoServ	AdvoServ Group Homes	OOS	RCC: Large Group Home	35	25	0	20	DE	28	DHR
2	RCCP	Bancroft Neuro Health	Bancroft Lindens	OOS	RCC Facility	1	1	0	0	NJ	1	DHR
3	RCCP	Bennington School	Bennington School Group Home	OOS	RCC: Large Group Home	2	3	0	19	VT	1	DHR
4	RCCP	Carlton Palms	Carlton Palms	OOS	RCC: Large Group Home	1	1	0	21	FL	1	DHR
5		Community-Based Residential Placement	Public			0	0	0	0		1	DHR
6	RCCP	Cumberland Hospital	Cumberland Hospital Facility	OOS	RCC: Large Group Home	3	10	0	20	VA	1	DHR
7	RCCP	Devereux National	Devereux GA Facility	OOS	Residential Treatment Center	2	1	0	20	GA	1	DHR
8	RCCP	Grafton School	Grafton Group Home	OOS	RCC: Large Group Home	8	10	0	20	VA	4	DHR

9	RCCP	Mid Atlantic Youth Services-Luzerne Co. Juv Ctr	Mid Atlantic Youth Services	OOS	RCC: Large Group Home	5	1	0	20	PA	1	DHR
10	RCCP	National Children's Center, Inc.	National Children's Center Group Home	OOS	Residential Treatment Center	3	10	0	20	DC	1	DHR
11	RCCP	San Marcos	San Marcos	OOS	RCC: Large Group Home	1	10	0	21	TX	1	DHR
12	RCCP	Summit Academy	Summit Academy	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	1	5	1	20	PA	1	DHR
13	RCCP	Universal Health Services/Keyston/Kidlink	UHS Palmetto Lowcountry Behavioral Health	OOS	Residential Group Home	1	1	0	0	SC	1	DHR
14	RCCP	Woods Services	The Woods School Devante Thomas	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	1	1	0	20	PA	1	DHR
15	RCCP	Woods Services	The Woods Group Home	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	1	10	0	20	PA	1	DHR

Total Placements 45

Family Home Settings

#	Sub-Category	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	State	Total	Reported Agency
1		Family Home Settings	Public			0	0	0	0		137	DHR
2	Restricted Relative Care	Diakon Lutheran Social Ministries	Diakon Lutheran Social Ministries	OOS	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	1	0	0	0	PA	1	DHR
3	Restricted Relative Care	Kidlink-Pennsylvania Clinical Schools	Kidlink Group Home	DHR	Residential Treatment Center	3	5	0	20	PA	1	DHR
4	Restricted Relative Care	Rejoice Inc.	Rejoice Inc.	OOS	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	1	0	0	0	PA	1	DHR
5	Restricted Relative Care	The Up Center	The Up Center	OOS	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	1	0	0	0	VA	1	DHR

Total Placements 141

Non-Community-Based Residential Placement

#	Sub-Category	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	State	Total	Reported Agency
1		Non-Community Based Residential Placement	Public			0	0	0	0		0	DHR
2	ASAM		Summit Academy Inpatient Drug and Alcohol Prg			0	0	0	0	PA	1	DJS
3	ASAM		Glen Mills Schools			0	0	0	0	PA	11	DJS
4	ASAM		Woodward Youth Corporation DBA, Woodward Academy			0	0	0	0	IA	10	DJS
5	ASAM		Summit Academy Traditional Program			0	0	0	0	PA	4	DJS
6	ASAM		Mid Atlantic Youth Services- Intensive Open Residential Treatment			0	0	0	0	PA	1	DJS

7	ASAM		Lakeside Academy			0	0	0	0	MI	1	DJS
8	ASAM		Keystone Continuum LLC- Natchez Trace Youth Academy			0	0	0	0	TN	3	DJS
9	ASAM		Cornell Abraxas Intensive and Drug Sellers			0	0	0	0	PA	7	DJS
10	ASAM		Clarinda Academy Residential Treatment Program			0	0	0	0	IA	18	DJS
11	ASAM		Canyon State Academy			0	0	0	0	AZ	12	DJS
12	DETP		Lakeview NeuroRehabilitation Center			0	0	0	0	NH	1	DJS
13	DETP		Summit Academy - Diag./Sanctions (Send Referrals)			0	0	0	0	PA	4	DJS
14	NonSecure		Woodward Youth Corporation DBA, Woodward Academy			0	0	0	0	IA	1	DJS

15	NonSecure		Mid-Atlantic Youth Services, Luzerne Co. Juv Ctr			0	0	0	0	PA	7	DJS
16	NonSecure		Cornell Abraxas Academy			0	0	0	0	PA	4	DJS
17	NonSecure		CCS of Lansing, Inc. -Turning Point Youth Center			0	0	0	0	MI	7	DJS
18	NonSecure		Mid Atlantic Youth Services- Western PA Child Care			0	0	0	0	PA	9	DJS
19	RTC	The Pines	The Pines Group Homes	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	6	25	0	20	VA	1	DHR
20	RTC		Keystone Newport News			0	0	0	0	VA	1	DJS
21	RTC		Devereux			0	0	0	0	GA	2	DJS
22	RTC		AdvoServ			0	0	0	0	DE	4	DJS
23	RTC		Cottonwood Treatment Center			0	0	0	0	UT	2	DJS
24	RTC		Cornell Abraxas Youth Center - Firesetter's Prog.			0	0	0	0	PA	5	DJS

25	RTC		Bennington School - Intensive Care			0	0	0	0	VT	1	DJS
26	RTC		Devereux (Florida)			0	0	0	0	FL	2	DJS
27	RTC		New Hope Carolinas - Residential Program			0	0	0	0	SC	1	DJS
28	RTC		Palmetto Low Country Behavioral Health			0	0	0	0	SC	1	DJS
29	RTC		Three Rivers Residential Treatment- Midland Campus			0	0	0	0	SC	1	DJS
30	RTC		Pines Young Men's Center			0	0	0	0	VA	2	DJS
31	RTC		Palmetto Summerville Behavioral Health- RTC			0	0	0	0	SC	1	DJS
32	RTC	Regional Institute for Children & Adolescents	Regional Institute for Children & Adolescents		Residential Treatment Center	0	0	0	120		5	MHA

Total Placements 130

Hospitalization

NONE

Unknown

#	Sub-Category	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	State	Total	Reported Agency
1	Unknown	Unknown	Public			0	0	0	0		1	DHR

Total Placements 1